

ON THE TREATY OF 927 WITH THE BULGARIANS

Ivan Dujčev

INTRODUCTION

Codex 483 (*olim* 323) in the collection of Greek manuscripts in the Vatican Library,¹ consisting of one hundred and ninety-two sheets of paper and written during the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, at first seems to contain only well-known texts of classical, patristic, and Byzantine authors. The first part of the manuscript includes one hundred thirty-five letters of Gregory of Nazianz, with six letters of Basil of Caesarea intercalated among them. Following this first group of letters comes another series of forty-four letters which are attributed to various philosophers: thirty-four letters of the cynic philosopher Crates,² one letter of Socrates to Plato, one letter of Aristotle to Theophrastus, one letter of Menippus of Gadara (in Coele-Syria), and letters of Heraclitus and the Scythian Anacharsis. The work of the rhetor Tiberius, *De schematibus*, fills eight sheets. This is followed by eight anonymous letters (*epistolae anonymae octo* [folios 58v–63]) on philosophy, etymology, and exegesis. On folios 64–103 we find the writings of the Byzantine author Nicephorus Blemmydes, *De anima* and *De corpore*. Next comes a large extract of the *Chronographia compendiaria* by the Byzantine chronicler Ioel. The manuscript ends with a collection of proverbs,³ the commentary of Themistius (Sophonias), *In Aristotelis Parva naturalia*, two fragments of letters of Isidore of Pelusium, and finally some notes of minor importance.

On folios 43–51, after the letters attributed to Anacharsis, we find the only extant copy of an important Byzantine text, under the title ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν Βουλγάρων συμβάσει (*On the treaty with the Bulgarians*), which Monsignor Robert Devreesse⁴ interpreted *nempe, ut videtur, sermo de pace quam anno 927 compo-suerunt Bulgari et Graeci*. This text attracted attention several centuries ago. Probably in the fifteenth century an unknown scribe added (fol. 1v) a note indicating the principal contents of the manuscript: *Ep(isto)le Gregorij Nazianzeni et quorunda(m) alior(um). Tractatus de Conuentione Bulgar or(um). Tyber(ii) de figuris rhetoricis.*⁵ In spite of this explicit reference, however, philologists and specialists on medieval and Byzantine history disregarded the anonymous text for some time.

During Napoleon's occupation of Italy this manuscript, together with other manuscripts and antiquities of the Vatican, was transferred to Paris and for a number of years was part of the manuscript collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale. Thus, as Monsignor Devreesse observes, *f. 1 et 182 imis sigillum*

¹ Description of the MS: R. Devreesse, *Codices Vaticani graeci. II. Codices 330–603* (Vatican City, 1937), 290–93.

² Ed. F. Boissonade, "Notice des lettres de Cratès le Cynique contenues dans le manuscrit 483 du Vatican," *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi et autres bibliothèques*, XI (Paris, 1827), pt. 2, 16–46; other bibliographical references in Devreesse, *op. cit.*, 491.

³ Devreesse, *op. cit.*, 292ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 291.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 293.

bibliothecae Nationalis Parisiensis rubrum, Vaticanae nigrum. It was probably at this time that our manuscript came into the hands of the well-known French Hellenist of German origin Carl Benedict Hase (1780–1864).⁶ In Hase's papers, which are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale as Suppl. grec 810, there is a long note, on folio 33, which refers specifically to the anonymous text in the MS: *Sequitur declamatio in pacem cum Bulgaris factam folio 43 recto. Titulus rubricatus, ... quorsum pertineat haec oratio nondum invenire potuimus; certe non extat inter scripta cognita Theophylacti Bulgarorum Archiepiscopi, de quo primum cogitabamus. Commemoratur in hac declamatione rex Bulgarorum Simeon filiusque nomine Petrus, quod decimum saeculum prodere videtur, quo post atrox bellum cum Romanis Petrus rex Bulgarorum Simeonis filius pace facta d. VIII octobris a(nno) 928 Mariam Romani Lecapeni Augosti neptin uxorem duxit. Vide Ducangium in Familiis Byzantinis 1680, fol. 313.*⁷ Two explanatory notes, one in Greek and one in Latin, were probably added by Hase.⁸

In the margin of the text concerning the conclusion of the peace treaty between Byzantium and Bulgaria several notes in Greek are added, suggesting the identification of the historical personalities referred to indirectly in the text.

From Hase's note cited above, it is evident that our text seemed of interest to him. He identified correctly the historical events to which the text relates, i.e., the peace between the Bulgarians and the Byzantine Empire in 927 (erroneously given as 928!),⁹ and the principal historical personalities involved. As for the author of the text, Hase's first hypothesis was that it was the work of Theophylact, Archbishop of Bulgaria. This hypothesis, however, is unacceptable on account of the chronological discrepancy: Theophylact, head of the Bulgarian Church between 1090 and 1107–8,¹⁰ lived at Ohrid more than a

⁶ A wealth of biographical and bibliographical indications on C. B. Hase is to be found in the studies of I. Ševčenko, "The Date and Author of the So-Called Fragments of Toparcha Goticus," *AIEtByz, Bulletin d'information et de coordination*, 5 (1971), 71–95, and "The Date and Author of the So-Called Fragments of Toparcha Goticus," *DOP*, 25 (1971), 117–88, with 28 facsimiles.

⁷ General description of the MS given by Hase in Cod. Suppl. grec 810, fols. 29–38v, under the indication 483; on our anonymous text, at fol. 33rv. After the words *Titulus rubricatus*, come the Greek title, the *incipit*, and the *desinit* of the text: title—ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν βουλγάρων συμβάσει; *incipit*—fol. 43, Εἰρήνην ὑμοῦμεν εὐφράνθητε; *desinit*—fol. 51, ἐπὶ σοι καὶ ἡμῖν ἀθάνατον καὶ αἰώνιον. In the original redaction of this note Hase introduced some additional corrections; thus, after *Archiepiscopi* he added *de quo primum cogitabamus*; instead of *Meminit auctor regis*, he added *Commemoratur /.../ in hac declamatione rex*, and other insignificant corrections. Th. I. Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo o bolgarsko-vizantijskih otноšenijah v pervoj polovině X věka," *Letopis istoriko-filologičeskago obščestva pri Imperatorskom Novorossijskom Universitete*, IV (Odessa, 1894) (hereafter Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo"), 51ff., reproduced this note of Hase, but incompletely and incorrectly.

⁸ Cf. Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 51ff. In Cod. Suppl. gr. 810, fol. 26, at the beginning of his description of the MS, Hase gives the following indication: 483. *Codex bombycinus, in 8. foliis 185 constans, in catalogo Romano No. 238 [Rasura]. Index graecus recenti manu in foliis aliquot chartaceis....* On the MS containing the notes of C. B. Hase, see H. Omont. *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale et des autres bibliothèques de Paris et des Départements*, III (Paris, 1888), 313.

⁹ For the exact chronology, see V. N. Zlatarski, *Istorija na būlgarskata dūržava prez svēdnite věkove. I, 2. Piervo būlgarsko carstvo* (Sofia, 1927) (hereafter Zlatarski, *Istorija*), 518ff. Cf. F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453. I. Regesten von 565–1025* (Munich-Berlin, 1924), 75, no. 612: "927 vor Okt. 8."

¹⁰ Biographical and bibliographical references in G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica. I. Die Byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvolker*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1958) (hereafter Moravcsik, *Byzan-*

century and a half later and cannot, therefore, be the author of the sermon delivered on events that took place at the end of 927. Hase was in error about the dates of Theophylact's life, which he put at the end of the tenth instead of the eleventh century. Thus, Hase was mistaken in identifying the author of this sermon with the Archbishop of Ohrid.¹¹ Nevertheless, Hase deserves credit, first of all, for ascertaining the historical importance of our text and, secondly, for proposing a precise and accurate chronology for the historical events with which our text is concerned.

While traveling in 1877 through Italy in search of sources on medieval Bulgarian history, the thirty-two-year-old Russian Byzantinist Th. I. Uspenskij (1845–1928) discovered the Vatican manuscript containing the text of the sermon.¹² This enigmatic document interested him greatly. Seventeen years later, in 1894, he published it.¹³ His study remains, up to the present day, the fundamental work on this text.

This study consists of a brief introduction followed by the Greek text, a Russian translation with notes, and a general analysis of the sermon as a historical source. It will be of some interest to recapitulate this work. Uspenskij supposes that the sermon was delivered in Constantinople in the church of Hagia Sophia,¹⁴ but the manuscript containing it must be dated at a period "not before the fourteenth century."¹⁵ He then quotes the description of the MS: *Cod. Vatic. 483, in 8° seu 4° min., saec. XIV exeuntis, compendiis scripturae refertus, minutissima quidem at nitidissima littera scriptus. Folia complectitur 185, praeter folia prævia septem. Videtur bombycinus, at revera chartaceus est, ut ex pluribus foliis patet.* After giving the contents of the codex, he turns his attention to the only anonymous text in it which begins on folio 43. According to him, the author's name was lacking already in the fourteenth century, when the manuscript was compiled, and the sermon had no title, either then or for several centuries afterward, as is proved by the fact that in the Latin index of the MS it is still included among the letters of the philosopher Anacharsis.¹⁶ On the other hand, this Latin index, which precedes chronologically the Greek one, could only be dated, according to Uspenskij, to the end of the eighteenth or the beginning of the nineteenth century. The title under which the text is known today is found for the first time in the Greek index.

As we have said above, in the margin of the text some unknown person added explanatory notes identifying the historical personages mentioned in

tinoturcica), 537–39; H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), 649 ff., *passim*; P. Gautier, "L'épiscopat de Théophylacte Héphaïstos archevêque de Bulgarie," *REB*, 21 (1963), 159–78; S. Maslev, "Les lettres de Théophylacte de Bulgarie à Nicéphore Mélissénos," *REB*, 30 (1972), 179–86.

¹¹ Cf. Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 52.

¹² Cf. Th. I. Uspenskij, *Vizantijskij pisatel' Nikita Akominat iz Han* (Saint Petersburg, 1874). Cf. also *idem*, *Obrazovanie vtorogo Bolgarskogo carstva* (Odessa, 1879).

¹³ Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 48–123.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 48.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 48–49.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 49. Cf. Devreesse, *op. cit. (supra, note 1)*, 291.

it. These marginal notes and the Greek index seem to Uspenskij to have been written by the same hand; but he is ready to admit that they could have been made by Hase.¹⁷

The historical analysis and the interpretation of the sermon, as Uspenskij himself recognizes, are fraught with many difficulties.¹⁸ To start with, he is inclined to interpret the sermon as a document concerning the history of the relations between Byzantium and the "Russians" either at the beginning or at the end of the tenth century. He supposes the author of the sermon to be an anonymous ecclesiastical orator, a member of the clergy at Constantinople proficient in the art of ecclesiastical rhetoric. By means of his rhetorical skill, evident in the literary quotations and allusions, the anonymous author presented historical facts in such a way that what was comprehensible for the people of his own time, who were contemporary with the events, is for us today an enigma. Here we find allusions to historical events of an entire century, presented not directly but rather conveyed by means of biblical and mythological references. Uspenskij compares the study of this text, with its rhetorical imagery and abstract contents, to the partaking of a luxurious feast, where, however, it is possible to pick up only a few crumbs. It is to be regretted, he declares, that the work is anonymous. Nevertheless he considers it opportune to publish the text of the sermon for several reasons. In the first place, the sermon gives a general survey of the relations between Byzantium and Bulgaria from the middle of the ninth to the middle of the tenth century, and this, moreover, from a special point of view, which is not usually found in the works of Byzantine annalists and historians. Secondly, because the anonymous author of the sermon possessed a very extensive literary knowledge, he quoted freely from the writings of profane and ecclesiastical authors, from mythological reminiscences, popular sayings, and diverse passages of the apocryphal literature; without him most of these quotations would have been lost irrevocably. Uspenskij points out that this kind of literature enables us to gain insight into the cultural level of this period. In the third place, the new Byzantine text throws light on Byzantine-Bulgarian relations at a time about which we possess rather limited information. Uspenskij reminds the reader that the text is preserved in only one copy containing lacunae and evident errors. In addition, he attempts to identify the numerous quotations from ecclesiastical, secular, and popular literature.

Uspenskij's introduction is followed by the edition of the Greek text based on the only extant copy, the Vatican MS. Uspenskij proposes several emendations of the text, always with reference to the *lectio* in the MS. He divides the text into paragraphs and adds a generally exact and clear Russian translation. Yet, as it will be seen, it is possible to make some corrections in the Greek text including new readings of single words or phrases and more plausible conjectures concerning certain passages, and also to identify certain quotations and allusions. Moreover, since Uspenskij's publication appeared

¹⁷ Uspenskij, "Neizdannoe cerkovnoe slovo," 50ff.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 94ff.

eighty-four years ago and was never reprinted, a new edition of this important historical text seems justified. It is also possible to amplify and to make essential emendations to Uspenskij's analysis and historical commentary.¹⁹ His statements concerning the chronology of the sermon are basically correct: the sermon deals with the historical events of A.D. 927; namely, the end of the long war between Bulgaria and Byzantium and the conclusion of the treaty of peace in October 927. He rightly points out the desire of the anonymous author to take the opportunity, in presenting these occurrences, to expound the more general problem of the evils of war and the advantages of peace which permitted him to embrace in his sermon a chronologically wider range of happenings. His work actually informs us, by means of allusions and, to a lesser extent, directly, about many historical events that occurred after the middle of the ninth century; namely, those which followed the conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity. The anonymous author never intended to speak as a historian; therefore he was not interested in presenting concrete historical facts. He spoke as an orator: a refined turn of phrase was far more important to him than factual content. On this premise, his work must be understood more as a work of literature and rhetoric than as a purely historical source.

In his commentary²⁰ Uspenskij analyzes both historical fact and rhetorical form in the sermon. He points out that the sermon consists of four different parts: a eulogy of the present time, i.e., a glorification of the peace between Byzantium and the Bulgarians; a chronicle of the past as an introduction and explanation of the circumstances leading to the present; the exposition of the immediately preceding events; and, finally, a prophecy on the future relations between Byzantium and the Bulgarians. According to Uspenskij's division of the text, paragraphs 5 to 10 form the first part of the sermon, the eulogy of the peace. This part of the work is more rhetorical, containing general exclamatory expressions and meditations on the benefits of peace. In the second part (pars. 11 to 17) the anonymous author seeks to introduce us to the events and must necessarily include more concrete historical detail; for the speaker, this had been a golden age in the history of the Byzantine Empire. It is difficult to establish chronologically precise limits, but it seems probable that what the author had in mind was approximately the beginning of the reigns of the Byzantine emperor Leo VI (886–912) and of the Bulgarian prince Boris Michael (852–89), or, more exactly, the period following the official conversion of the Bulgarian people to Christianity in 865,²¹ up to, and including, the Byzantine-Bulgarian conflict during the reign of King Symeon (893–927). In this second part of the sermon the anonymous author describes the historical events which occurred between 912–13 and the end of May 927—death of Symeon and beginning of the reign of his son Peter (927–69). The conclusion of the peace treaty (in October 927) constitutes the transition from

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 50–54, 94–123.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 94 ff.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 98 ff.

the second to the third part of the sermon. In the third part (pars. 18 to 20) the orator describes the benefits of the new era—the era of peace. The fourth and last part (pars. 21 and 22) contains admonitions on the advantages of peace and the evils of war, with advice on how to preserve peace. After this analysis of the contents, Uspenskij points out that not all sections of the sermon have identical historical importance as a source for the study of the relations between Byzantium and the Bulgarians.²² Since the third and fourth parts are, in their contents, predominantly rhetorical, he focuses his attention on the first and second parts, which are richer in historical data.

The central idea of the sermon, as Uspenskij indicates, is in fact the peace which was the consequence of the Byzantine-Bulgarian treaty of October 927. The internal tranquillity of the Empire was only of secondary importance as compared with the establishment of peaceful relations with external adversaries.²³ The conclusion of the peace treaty with the Bulgarians was, unquestionably, a great political success for the Emperor Romanus I Lecapenus (920–44) and contributed considerably to consolidating his power.²⁴ A close analysis of the text of the sermon indicates that the Byzantine author was indeed concerned primarily with external enemies and, consequently, rejoiced at the conclusion of the peace with the Bulgarians. The idea of the spiritual unity between Byzantium and the Bulgarians is a reflection of the Byzantine concept of “a family of princes and peoples.”²⁵ In accepting the Christian religion from Constantinople, the Bulgarians had become “spiritual sons” of the Byzantines, and the Bulgarian king a son of the emperor of Byzantium. These elements in the relations between Byzantium and the Bulgarians are only partially discerned by Uspenskij.

The Russian scholar then proceeds to discuss Hase’s hypothesis that the author of this sermon was Theophylact of Ohrid.²⁶ He disagrees with this conjecture, pointing out that, in the first place, no such sermon is known

²² *Ibid.*, 97ff., 122ff.

²³ *Ibid.*, 97ff.

²⁴ Cf. S. Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and His Reign. A Study of Tenth-Century Byzantium* (Cambridge, 1929), 71: “The Bulgarian peace of 927.... The capital was now well reconciled to Romanus’s rule. He had, however, one more plot there with which to deal—one of a new significant type. He had fortified himself against the legitimate house by raising his own family; but now the members of his own family, too large to be manageable, were suffering from ambition and longing for the hegemony....”

²⁵ Concerning this concept, see G. Ostrogorsky, “Die byzantinische Staatenhierarchie,” *SemKond*, 8 (1936), 41–61. Cf. F. Dölger, in *BZ*, 36 (1936), 495–96; *idem*, “Die ‘Familie der Könige’ im Mittelalter,” *Festgabe f. H. v. Heckel* (= *HJ*, 60 [1940], 397–420; reprinted in *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt, Ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze* [Ettal, 1953], 34–69); *idem*, “Bulgarisches Zartum und byzantinisches Kaisertum,” *IzvArhInst*, 9 (1935), 57–68, reprinted in *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt*, 140–58; *idem*, “Die mittelalterliche ‘Familie der Fürsten und Völker’ und der Bulgarenherrscher,” *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt*, 159–182 (an abbreviated version from the *Studie Dölgers*, first published in Bulgarian translation [made by I. Dujčev] from the original German manuscript, under the title “Srednovekovnoto semejstvo na vladetelite i narodite i būgarskiyat vladetel,” in *SpBAN, Klon ist.-filol.*, 66, fasc. 32 [1943], 181–222); *idem*, “Der Bulgarenherrscher als geistlicher Sohn des byzantinischen Kaisers,” in *Sbornik v pamet na prof. Peter Nikov* (= *IzvIstDr*, 16–18 [1940]), 219–32, reprinted in *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt*, 183–96. A. Grabar, “God and the ‘Family of Princes’ Presided Over by the Byzantine Emperor,” *HSSt*, 2 (1959), 117–23, reprinted in *idem, L’art de la fin de l’Antiquité et du Moyen Age*, I (Paris, 1968), 115–19.

²⁶ Cod. Paris. Suppl. gr. 810, fol. 26ff.; here, p. 220–21.

among the works of the Archbishop of Ohrid.²⁷ Moreover, both the spirit of the work and the attitude of the author diverge from those of Theophylact of Ohrid, a difference manifest in Theophylact's correspondence which reveals a negative attitude toward the Bulgarians.²⁸ Hase's hypothesis must also be rejected because of its chronological incongruity. Instead, Uspenskij proposes his own hypothesis and declares that the most likely author of the sermon is the Patriarch of Constantinople, Nicholas Mysticus (901–7, 912–25),²⁹ who exchanged numerous letters with the Bulgarian Czar Symeon over a period of more than ten years.³⁰ I must agree with Uspenskij when he emphasizes the identity of ideas, literary mannerisms, and other language peculiarities of Nicholas Mysticus with those of the author of the sermon. Yet, Uspenskij is forced to admit the existence of "certain chronological difficulties"³¹ in the attribution of the sermon to the Patriarch. I must also agree with his statement that the interpretation of many passages of this sermon would remain inexplicable without a parallel study of Nicholas Mysticus' correspondence with Symeon of Bulgaria. It should not be forgotten, however, that these similarities in ideas and literary mannerisms are traits common to the general mentality of the period.

Uspenskij points out that in the sermon any account of concrete facts is absent. This lack of indisputable historical data allows for contradictory interpretations, and for this reason all proposed interpretations must remain—according to him³²—more or less hypothetical. Seeking for an answer to the question of the authorship, he correctly remarks that historical events, discussed

²⁷ Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 51 ff., 99 ff.

²⁸ Text of this correspondence in PG, 126, cols. 308–557; translation into Bulgarian by Metropolit Symeon, "Pismata na Teofilakta Ohridski arhiepiskop Bûlgarski," *Sbornik na Bûlgarskata Akademija na naukite*, 27 (1931). Cf. I. Dujčev, in *Slavia*, 13.1 (1934), 124–26. Analysis of this correspondence as historical source, in V. N. Zlatarski, *Istoriya na bûlgarskata dûržava prez srđnitë vëkove*, II (Sofia, 1934), 252 ff. D. A. Xanalatos, *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte Makedoniens im Mittelalter, hauptsächlich auf Grund der Briefe des Erzbischofs Theophylaktos von Achrida* (Munich, 1937); cf. also I. Dujčev, *Makedonski pregled*, 12.2 (1940), 134–43. Bibliographical references in Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 538–39. See also S. Maslev, "Za roljata i značenieto na dejnostta na Teofilakt Ohridski kato arhiepiskop bûlgarski," *Izvestija na Instituta za bûgarska istorija*, 23 (1974), 235–47. Serbian translation and commentary (by R. Katičić), in *Fontes Byzantini historiam populorum Jugoslaviae spectantes*, III (Belgrade, 1966), 257–360.

²⁹ Biographical and bibliographical notes in Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 455–56. See also I. Ch. Konstantinides, Νικόλαος Α', ὁ Μυστικός (ca. 852–925 μ. Χ.), πατριάρχης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (901–907, 912–925). Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν καὶ πολιτικὴν ιστορίαν τοῦ α' τετάρτου τοῦ Ι' μ. Χ. αἰώνος (Athens, 1967); A. Stauridou-Zaphraka, 'Η συνάντηση Συμέων καὶ Νικολάου Μυστικοῦ (Αὔγουστος 913) στὰ πλαίσια τοῦ βυζαντινού λαγαρικοῦ δινταγωνισμοῦ' (Thessalonica, 1972). Cf. also I. Božilov, in *Bulgarian Historical Review*, 1.4 (1973), 120 ff.; M. Sjuzumov, in *Viz. Vrem.*, 35 (1973), 260.

³⁰ Text of the correspondence in PG, 111, cols. 27–392; new critical edition and English translation, by R. J. H. Jenkins and L. G. Westerink, *Nicholas I, Patriarch of Constantinople, Letters*, CFHB, IV, DOT, II (Washington, D. C., 1973). Bulgarian translation with commentary by V. N. Zlatarski, "Pismata na carigradskija patriarch Nikolaja Mistika do bûgarskija car Simeona," *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija, nauka i knižnina*, 10 (1894), 372–428; 11 (1894), 5–54; 12 (1895), 121–211; new edition of the Bulgarian translation, in *Fontes Graeci Historiae Bulgaricae*, IV (Sofia, 1961), 185–297; Bulgarian translation of three letters, by I. Dujčev, "Pismo na carigradskija patriarch Nikolaj Mistika do arhiepiskopa na Bûlgarija," *Prometej*, 3, fasc. 4 (1939), 26–28; "Dve pisma na carigradskija patriarch Nikolaj Mistika vûz vrûzka s našeto minalo," *Prometej*, 3, fasc. 5 (1939), 23–27. For analysis of the letters, Zlatarski, *Istoriya*, 320 ff.

³¹ Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 100.

³² *Ibid.*, 100 ff.

or simply mentioned in the sermon as having occurred recently, must be taken as the terminus ante quem non for the date of the sermon itself. It follows that, when we meet with uncertain and vague allusions in the text, the interpretation will also be approximative and hypothetical. His interpretation is based primarily on paragraph 16 of the sermon, where he sees allusions to the meeting of the Emperor Romanus I Lecapenus with King Symeon of Bulgaria in September 923.³³ In paragraph 17 the orator speaks of a treaty of peace, which would be the treaty between Byzantium and the Bulgarians made after the death of Symeon, in October 927:³⁴ it is this date which, in Uspenskij's opinion, furnishes the terminus post quem for the composition of the sermon. As a literary parallel to paragraph 17 Uspenskij names the twenty-fifth letter of Nicholas Mysticus to Symeon.³⁵ As to the question of the date of earlier historical events related by the anonymous author, Uspenskij mentions paragraph 3, which alludes to the "spiritual filiation" of the Bulgarians in respect to the Byzantines. For appropriate parallels he refers again to several letters of Nicholas Mysticus to Symeon.³⁶ Other parallels he finds between certain passages in the Patriarch's letters and the orator's description of Symeon's ravages in the vicinity of Constantinople. As another source clarifying the sermon, the Russian scholar cites the correspondence between Romanus Lecapenus and Symeon.³⁷ In his analysis of paragraph 7, he finds references to the war between the Byzantines and the Bulgarians after the death of Leo VI (12 May 912). The allusion to the golden era in the history of the Byzantine Empire, in which the words of I Par. 27f. are used, points to the reign of Leo VI. Here the orator once again speaks of the spiritual "adoption" of the Bulgarians by the Byzantines, brought about by their Christianization; thus the Christian religion was a basic factor in the relations between Byzantium and Bulgaria.

In his commentary Uspenskij further deals with the problem arising from the author's reference to the Bulgarians as being ἀμαξόβιοι and nomads. He takes the term ἀμαξόβιοι as evidence of the presence of a non-Slavic ethnic element among the Bulgarian people. Nowadays this problem can be considered as resolved, and therefore the discussion of the Russian scholar is only of historiographical interest. In paragraph 12 Uspenskij sees proof that the anonymous author was witness to the historical events related in his sermon and states that the chief object of the wars waged by Symeon against the Byzantine Empire was to seize the imperial crown (*stephos*). He also believes

³³ On this historical event, see Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 464ff.

³⁴ For details, see *ibid.*, 521ff.

³⁵ Uspenskij, "Neizdannoe cerkovnoe slovo," 102ff.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 103ff.

³⁷ This correspondence is edited by J. Sakkellion, 'Ρωμανοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ Λακαπηνοῦ ἐπιστολαί, in Δελτ. Ετ. Ελλ., 1 (1883–84), 657–66; 2 (1885–86), 34–48. Bulgarian translation with commentary by V. N. Zlatarski, "Pismata na vizantijskiya imperator Romana Lakapena do būlgarskiya car Simeona," *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija, nauka i knižnina*, 13 (1896), 282–322; republished in *Fontes Graeci Historiae Bulgaricae*, IV (Sofia [1961]), 298–314. Cf. Dölger, *Regesten* (*supra*, note 9), nos. 606–8; Moravcsik, *Byzantinoiurcica*, 502–3. Analysis in Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 485ff., 830ff. I am preparing a new edition of these letters.

that here the author used a hitherto unknown apocryphal legend. This hypothesis is bold but unconvincing, for the expression Uspenskij is concerned with, far from being a borrowing from some unknown "poetical work," is simply a paraphrase of Homer, *Iliad* 11.500. In the sentence which immediately follows Uspenskij finds an allusion to the arbitrary appropriation by the Bulgarian ruler of the imperial title, namely, that of *basileus* of the Romans and Bulgarians. On the basis of an incorrect reading of ἀθετεῖ instead of εὐθετεῖ, his interpretation of this passage is that Symeon "casts away the father," but at the same time "confirms the spirit." As a matter of fact, this passage of the sermon should only be interpreted in the sense of the Byzantine theory of spiritual relationships and the "family of the princes and the peoples."³⁸ Thus, when the rhetor asserts that Symeon betrays fidelity toward the "father," he refers to this spiritual "family" of rulers and peoples. By so doing, Czar Symeon betrays also the "spirit," i.e., the established system of relations between Christian sovereigns and their peoples. Although lacking a clear conception of this Byzantine theory, Uspenskij nonetheless cites as a parallel the text of the twenty-fifth epistle of the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus.³⁹ Paragraph 13 also alludes to the attitude of the Bulgarian Czar toward the Empire and to his violation of the system of spiritual relationship between Byzantium and the Bulgarians. In this same paragraph Uspenskij seeks to discover further indications of Symeon's attitude toward the Senate of Constantinople; unfortunately, the letters of the Czar addressed to the members of the Senate with the definite purpose of harming the new emperor Romanus Lecapenus and of presenting him as an usurper of the supreme power in Byzantium have not come down to us. But, on the basis of the answers of the Patriarch, it is possible to reconstruct to some extent their content or at least to understand the general concepts formulated by Symeon. Uspenskij's hypothesis⁴⁰ is that the Czar dwelled upon the significance of the imperial power and the usurpation perpetrated by Romanus Lecapenus; and that he claimed his own rights to the imperial crown of the Byzantine Empire on the ground of his spiritual adoption. The twenty-eighth letter of the Patriarch,⁴¹ as Uspenskij points out, contains interesting information about the arguments used by Symeon.⁴²

From this point onward, Uspenskij uses the correspondence of the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus for his interpretation of the various allusions contained in the text of the sermon. Thus, to the passage regarding the question whether or not a person of non-Byzantine origin may become ruler of the Empire he sees parallels in the eighteenth and nineteenth letters of the Patriarch.⁴³ Nicholas Mysticus' letters also offer Uspenskij ways to interpret passages of the sermon containing evidence of the internal crisis of the Empire which

³⁸ See *supra*, note 25.

³⁹ Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 113ff.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 115ff.

⁴¹ PG, 111, col. 180.

⁴² Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 115.

⁴³ PG, 111, cols. 121 and 128. Cf. Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 116.

immediately followed the death of the Emperor Leo VI and of his brother Alexander (6 June 913).

In the Vatican manuscript, where the anonymous author mentions the "new Proteus" (par. 14), there is a marginal note identifying the latter as Constantine the Eunuch. Uspenskij considers this identification "unsatisfactory" because it contradicts the historical information concerning this personage.⁴⁴ Instead, he proposes as more probable the identification of the "new Proteus" with the Emperor Romanus Lecapenus. In paragraph 15 Romanus Lecapenus is alluded to again, but under the name of Moses. From a historical point of view the last paragraphs of the sermon are easy to interpret: they contain a narration both of the meeting of Romanus Lecapenus with Symeon and of the conclusion of the treaty of peace between Byzantium and the Bulgarians.

Uspenskij adds some remarks about the rhetor's learning and his view of the world.⁴⁵ Concrete historical references take a relatively limited space in the sermon because the author is more concerned with his own reflections and feelings about contemporary events than with the concrete events themselves. The anonymous writer is well versed not only in ecclesiastical literature but also in ancient history, mythology, philosophy, rhetorical art, poetry, and popular literature. In spite of all this, his work should not be considered merely a reflection of the ideas and literary trends of his time. On the contrary, this sermon reveals great individuality both as a literary work and as a historical source. In order to demonstrate to his audience the advantages of peace, the rhetor touches upon the realities of life and everyday affairs. In paragraph 8, when referring to the life of domestic animals and to bees and ants, the author probably uses—as Uspenskij has pointed out⁴⁶—the text of the Byzantine *Physiologus*.⁴⁷ In observing life and the harmony of the cosmos, especially in respect to the life of animals, he compares it with human society. As a parallel to these reflections of the Byzantine author, Uspenskij cites numerous passages from Nicholas Mysticus' letters,⁴⁸ as well as several other passages from the correspondence between Romanus Lecapenus and Symeon of Bulgaria.⁴⁹ Realistic descriptions are further found, according to Uspenskij,⁵⁰ in paragraphs 18 and 19 (on rural life) and in paragraph 21.

As to the identification of the author of the sermon, Uspenskij calls attention to paragraph 2; here, he asserts, is evidence that the author was a member of the Constantinopolitan high clergy,⁵¹ while in paragraph 3 he sees evidence of his high social position. Although Uspenskij admits that this is insufficient to determine with any certainty the identity of the author of the sermon, as

⁴⁴ Uspenskij "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 117ff.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 120ff.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁴⁷ Critical edition of the Greek text published by F. Sbordone (Milan-Genoa-Rome-Naples, 1936).

⁴⁸ Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 121ff.

⁴⁹ PG, 111, cols. 188, 116, 140, 141, 193.

⁵⁰ Sakkelion, *op. cit.*, 2 (*supra*, note 37), 46.

⁵¹ Uspenskij, "Neizdanneo cerkovnoe slovo," 122.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 122.

we have mentioned above he sees only one possible identification—that with the Patriarch of Constantinople, Nicholas Mysticus.⁵³ There remains, however, a very serious chronological discrepancy. It is generally agreed that the peace treaty between Byzantium and the Bulgarians was concluded in October 927, when Nicholas Mysticus had been dead for more than two years.⁵⁴ In an effort to resolve this difficulty, Uspenskij proposes that the conclusion of the peace between the two enemies might have taken place in two separate stages; had not some kind of peace perhaps been established before the marriage of the Czar Peter with Maria, daughter of Christophorus and granddaughter of the Emperor Romanus Lecapenus? But even assuming the possibility of two different stages in the establishment of the peace, Uspenskij is unable to reconcile these two hypothetical moments with the actual historical chronology. Utilizing his assumption, one may go so far as to admit that the conclusion of the peace and the resumption of pacific relations between Byzantium and Bulgaria may be dated to the year 926—that is, one year before the marriage of the Czar Peter and the princess Maria Lecapena, and one year after the death of the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus; but a chronological discrepancy remains in any case. In fact, Uspenskij leaves open the question of the identification of the author. And yet, although this identification is presented by him only as a hypothesis badly in need of solid proof, some modern historians have accepted it as being beyond any doubt.⁵⁵

Uspenskij's publication immediately attracted the attention of scholars and was the object of several book reviews. Thus, the distinguished specialist in the field of Byzantine philology and literature Eduard Kurtz (1846–1925) of Riga accepted in his detailed review⁵⁶ Uspenskij's comments on the text of the sermon, which he describes as "eine in der Sophienkirche über einen mit den Bulgaren geschlossenen Frieden gehaltene Rede, die der Vaticanus gr. 483, ein Sammelcodex aus dem Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts, ohne Überschrift und Nennung des Autors enthält; denn der jetzt in der Handschrift stehende Titel...ist, wie Uspenskij meint, erst später, in unserem Jahrhundert, hinzugefügt," and writes further: "Denselben Ursprung weist Uspenskij den historischen Notizen am Rande der Handschrift zu; dort ist nämlich der Versuch gemacht, die Persönlichkeiten, die der Redner erwähnt, aber ganz unbestimmt mit allegorischen, aus der Bibel und altgriechischen Mythologie und Geschichte entlehnten Namen andeutet, zu bestimmen und mit ihrem wirklichen Namen zu bezeichnen." At this point the reviewer adds some remarks about the sermon itself: "Die Rede, die sich auf den im J. 927 mit Petros, dem Sohne des Symeon von Bulgarien, geschlossenen Frieden bezieht, bietet in sprachlicher und sachlicher Hinsicht grosse Schwierigkeiten. Der Verfasser der Rede, der offenbar zu den Spitzen der hauptstädtischen Geistlichkeit gehört und umfassende Belesenheit und Gelehrsamkeit auf den verschiedensten Gebieten

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 122 f. See *infra*, p. 230.

⁵⁴ He died 15 May 925; cf. V. Grumel, *Traité d'études byzantines. I. La chronologie* (Paris, 1958), 436.

⁵⁵ Cf., for example, Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 455, and, with some doubt, 223.

⁵⁶ E. Kurtz, in *BZ*, 4 (1895), 615–16.

des Wissens an den Tag legt, beherrscht vollkommen alle Mittel der rhetorischen Kunst, aber nach der in der byzantinischen Litteratur allgemein verbreiteten Sitte umgeht er es ängstlich, in seiner Epideixis reale Facta und historische Namen zu erwähnen, sondern beschränkt sich darauf, die zeitgenössischen Ereignisse, die ihm und seinen Zuhörern ja wohlbekannt waren, blos anzudeuten und hinter rhetorischen Figuren und allegorischen Vergleichen zu verstecken, so dass der heutige Leser sich in seinen dunklen Andeutungen und Anspielungen nur schwer zurechtfinden kann”⁵⁷

After describing the general characteristics of the anonymous work, Kurtz emphasizes its importance as a historical source: “Trotzdem hat die Rede nicht geringen Wert, erstens als Literaturdenkmal an sich, als interessantes Specimen der hochentwickelten rhetorischen Kunst im Anfange des 10. Jahrhunderts, sodann aber auch als Beitrag zur Geschichte der bulgaro-byzantinischen Beziehungen im 9. und 10. Jh., über die sich bei den eigentlichen Geschichtschreibern, nur ziemlich dürftige Nachrichten finden....” As he comes to the problem of the authorship of our sermon, he repeats the hypothesis already formulated by Uspenskij, with the arguments *pro et contra*: “Als den Verfasser dieser anonym überlieferten Rede glaubt Uspenskij mit grosser Wahrscheinlichkeit den Patriarchen Nikolaos Mystikos in Anspruch nehmen zu dürfen, aus dessen Briefwechsel mit Symeon von Bulgarien er verschiedene Gedanken als für diese Annahme sprechend anführt; besonders hebt er die bei beiden gleichartige Beurteilung einzelner Facta hervor, namentlich die Verurteilung des Krieges zwischen den Griechen und den Bulgaren als eines Bruderzwistes und die Betonung der geistlichen Sohnschaft, in der die Bulgaren zu Byzanz, das ihnen den christlichen Glauben übermittelt hat, stehen....” However, he does not find the arguments well-grounded. “Aber dies alles scheint doch nicht von so individueller Natur zu sein, dass nicht auch eine andere Person zu jener Zeit diese Auffassung teilen konnte, die wohl im Bewusstsein aller Zeitgenossen lag.” He recalls the chronological discrepancy: “Dazu kommt die chronologische Schwierigkeit auf die Uspenskij selbst hinweist, dass der Patriarch Nikolaos bereits im J. 925 gestorben ist, also zwei Jahre vor dem in unserer Rede verherrlichten Friedensschlusse.”⁵⁸

The emendations of the text proposed by Kurtz are very important and have been accepted in the present edition of the sermon. In some passages Kurtz gives his own translation of the Greek text. For example, at p. 68, line 18 (ed. Uspenskij), he suggests the following translation: “als nach Salomo, dem friedereichen und weisen, die Herde durch Jeroboam auseinandergerissen wurde....” At p. 70 line 6: “dass das Geschenk aus der Hand des Höchsten kommt, das möchte wohl auch ein Blinder....einsehen.” At p. 75 line 16, he proposes the interpretation “wenn wir auch irgendwie, sowie jene [d.h. die Heiden: p. 75 line 1] vom richtigen Weg abgekommen sind [denn wir haben an der nämlichen Schöpfung, wenn auch nicht an ihrem Irrtum, teil d.h. wir sind ja ebenso

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 615.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 615–16.

Menschen wie die Heiden, aber freilich durch die christliche Religion erleuchtet], so mögen wir doch, auf den richtigen Weg zurückgeführt [zur Friedfertigkeit], uns nicht mehr davon abbringen lassen....” Finally he remarks: “Anderes, worin wir vom Herausgeber abweichen zu müssen glauben, müssen wir hier übergehen, weil es sich nicht gut in Kürze darlegen lässt....”⁵⁹ In short, Kurtz’ critical observations have been singularly useful for the interpretation of our sermon.

Simultaneously with Kurtz, another Russian scholar, B. Melioranskij, wrote a short bibliographical note⁶⁰ in which he summarizes Uspenskij’s study and points out his hesitation on the matter of the chronology of the anonymous work. The edition made by Uspenskij attracted also the attention of the great German Byzantinist Karl Krumbacher, who immediately included it in the bibliographical notes of his monumental work, adding some interesting observations: “Von einem Zeitgenossen des Nikolaos Mystikos stammt eine in der Sophienkirche gehaltene, ohne Autornamen in Cod. Vatic. gr. 483 überlieferte Rede, welche sich auf den im Jahre 927 mit Petros, dem Sohne des Symeon von Bulgarien, geschlossenen Frieden bezieht. Leider scheut sich der Verfasser nach der leidigen Sitte der byzantinischen Rhetorik von einer genaueren Bezeichnung von Tatsachen und Namen, so dass sich der historische Untergrund seiner dunkeln Andeutungen und allegorischen Vergleiche nicht mit genügender Deutlichkeit erkennen lässt.”⁶¹ From these remarks it is obvious that Krumbacher does not agree with Uspenskij as to the authorship of the sermon. While the Russian scholar proposed, not without some hesitation, the name of Nicholas Mysticus, the conjecture of the German scholar is that the work must be ascribed with greater probability to a contemporary of the Patriarch.

In 1900, about six years after the publication of the anonymous text, a detailed study by I. Kuznecov appeared.⁶² The author proposed to analyze the correspondence of the Byzantine envoy to Bulgaria in the years 894–96, Leo Magister Choerosphaktes,⁶³ with the Bulgarian prince Symeon and that of the Emperor Romanus Lecapenus with the same Bulgarian ruler,⁶⁴ as well as the contents of our sermon. But Kuznecov’s study remained incomplete. In his published work, the author gives only general information about the history of Bulgaria under Czar Symeon and about Byzantine-Bulgarian relations during this period; he mentions the correspondence between Leo Magister and Symeon and publishes the letters partly in the original

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 616.

⁶⁰ *VizVrem*, 2 (1895), 246–47.

⁶¹ Krumbacher, 458–59.

⁶² I. Kuznecov, “Pismata na Lüva Magistra i Romana Lakapina i slovoto ‘Ἐπι τῇ τῶν Βουλγάρων συμβάσει,’ *Sbornik za narodni umotvoreniya, nauka i knižnina*, 16–17 (1900), 179–245.

⁶³ Last critical edition of this correspondence was published by G. Kolias, *Léon Choerosphactès magistre, proconsul et patrice. Biographie, correspondance (Texte et traduction)*, TFBByzNgPhil, 31 (Athens, 1939). For other bibliographical information about this correspondence, see Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 397–98.

⁶⁴ First edition by Sakkelion (*supra*, note 37). Cf. also Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 502–3, with complementary bibliographical notices. Bulgarian translation of Lecapenus’ letters to Symeon: Zlatarski, “Pismata” (*supra*, note 37); *idem, Istoriya*, 830–36.

text, partly in Bulgarian translation, with his commentary. Then he continues with the history of Byzantine-Bulgarian relations at the time of the Emperor Romanus Lecapenus, adding detailed references to the correspondence of Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus as well as to some Byzantine chronicles. Contrary to the reader's expectation, since the sermon of 927 is cited in the title of his study, not a word is said on the subject. The supplementary study which one would have expected was never published.

Ten years later, the Bulgarian historian D. Zuhlev, who was interested predominantly in the history of the Bulgarian Church, examined the sermon as a historical source.⁶⁵ Disregarding the caution and hesitation of the editor, Zuhlev accepts some of Uspenskij's conjectures as historical facts; for him, the sermon is undoubtedly the work of Nicholas Mysticus. Further, he agrees with Uspenskij on the matter of the arrangements toward the marriage between the Bulgarian Czar Peter and the Byzantine princess Maria Irene; according to him, these took place after, not before, the conclusion of the peace treaty. This seems probable, for the negotiations between the two countries treated all problems concerning their relations, and it was not until after everything was settled that the peace treaty was signed and confirmed by the marriage.

In 1919 the Italian Byzantinist and patrologist Monsignor Giovanni Mercati published a short note in which he proposed some emendations to the text of the sermon.⁶⁶ Mercati dates the Vatican MS containing the text to the thirteenth-fourteenth century, while Uspenskij was inclined to attribute it to the late fourteenth century.⁶⁷ His emendation concerns the beginning of this anonymous work: "Chi ha sperimentato l'utilità degli inizi per il riconoscimento degli scritti anepigrafi e pseudepigrafi, non troverà superfluo che si dia il vero principio del discorso per la pace coi Bulgari nel 927 tenuto a S. Sofia di Costantinopoli," declares Mercati. He then quotes the *incipit* from Uspenskij's edition: Εἰρήνη ἀφ' ὑψους, σκιρτήσατε. εἰρήνην ὑμοῦμεν, εὐφράνθητε. εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις Σιών, αἱ θυγατέρες Ἱερουσαλήμ χορεύσατε. To this he objects, "Ma εἰρήνη è correzione dell'editore invece dell' εἰρήνην del m[anoscritto], e correzione non felice, che toglie alla prima coppia il parallelismo (per così dire) di costruzione alle due coppie seguenti. E' poi la conseguenza di un abbaglio circa il luogo preciso di un supplemento fatto dal copista medesimo, il quale dapprima aveva saltato le parole Εἰρήνη. – σκιρτήσατε. Volendole supplire, lo fece nella riga superiore, di seguito alla rubrica (che da ciò risulta *originale*, e non già del secolo XIX, come sogno l'Uspenskij) Ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν Βουλγάρων συμβάσει, però tirando insieme una linea che parte di mezzo ad εὐφράνθητε· εἰρήνην e termina avanti all' εἰρήνην supplito, per avvertire che colà e non altrove va il supplemento." Finally Mercati concludes: "Pertanto devesi leggere: Εἰρήνην ὑμοῦμεν, εὐφράνθητε· εἰρήνην ἀφ' ὑψους, σκιρτήσατε· εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις Σιών, αἱ

⁶⁵ D. Zuhlev, *Istorija na būlgarskata cirkva. I. Pūrvi period (864–1186)* (Sofia, 1910), 411 note 3, 415–16.

⁶⁶ G. Mercati, "Minuzie. 31. Correzione al discorso per la pace coi Bulgari." *Bessarione*, 35 (1919), 38–39; reprinted in *idem, Opere minori raccolte in occasione del settantesimo natalizio*, IV, ST, 79 (Città del Vaticano, 1937), 57–58.

⁶⁷ Mercati, *op. cit.*, 57 note 1. On the Vatican MS, see also G. Przychocki, in *EOS*, 16 (1910), 104ff.

Ὥυγατέρες Ἱερουσαλήμ συγχορεύσατε (così il ms. e non χορεύσατε, come nell'edizione)." Especially worthy of note is Mercati's opinion that the title is original, not a modern addition as Uspenskij believed.

In his detailed history of the Bulgarian state in the Middle Ages the distinguished Bulgarian historian Vasil N. Zlatarski wrote about the reign of the Czar Symeon, making use of the sermon as a source for that period. Therefore, he mentions the suggestion found in our text⁶⁸ concerning the meeting between Symeon and Romanus I Lecapenus in early September 923. He apparently accepts the evidence of the Anonymous as reliable, calling in question only the allegation made by the Byzantine author on the "corrupted Greek language" spoken by the Bulgarian Czar. Taking into consideration the fact that Symeon as a young man spent "about ten years" in Constantinople and, moreover, studied at the famous academy of Magnaura, where he learned the Greek language so well that his contemporaries nicknamed him *Hemiargos*, i.e., "Semi-Greek," such a statement does not ring true. Zlatarski sees here a rhetorical figure of speech, intentionally aimed at slighting the Bulgarian ruler.

In an attempt to solve the question concerning the initiative for the negotiations between Byzantium and Bulgaria after Symeon's death, Zlatarski once again resorts to the sermon. In some of its passages he sees allusions to the Bulgarians taking the first step toward the peace negotiations.⁶⁹ The meeting between the Emperor Romanus and Symeon's successor, Peter, Zlatarski accepts as authentic. Here he corrects a slight error in the translation of Uspenskij.⁷⁰ Finally, since he cannot find any reference in the sermon to the wedding ceremony of Peter and Maria Irene, he concludes that the sermon must have been delivered immediately after the conclusion of the peace treaty.⁷¹ On the whole, Zlatarski does not make full use of all the evidence furnished by our source and, moreover, is very cautious in utilizing the sermon as a historical source. In all probability he thought that the text needed a thorough analysis before it could be regarded as a reliable document.⁷²

After Zlatarski called attention to the sermon, other Bulgarian scholars examined it as a source of references for diverse fields of scholarship. Among others, I. Sakâzov in 1929 looked for data for the economic history of the Bulgarian people.⁷³ Recognizing in the anonymous author a "Geistlicher in Konstantinopel," he quotes the passage containing a reference to the abandonment on the part of the Bulgarians of the nomadic way of life: "Sie [the Bulgarians] wurden von unserem Gott als Söhne angenommen und entwöhnten sich ihrer amazonischen und nomadischen Sitten." Strictly speaking, this is

⁶⁸ Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 467 note 1.

⁶⁹ Sermon, paragraphs 16–17. Cf. Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 522 note 1.

⁷⁰ Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 524 note 1.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 534 note 1.

⁷² It was Professor Zlatarski, my university teacher, who suggested to me in 1930 to undertake a detailed study of this historical document and to prepare a new critical edition, which was first presented as my dissertation at the University of Sofia in 1932.

⁷³ I. Sakâzov, *Bulgarische Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1929). On this publication, see my review of it in *IzvArhInst*, 7 (1932–33), 433–38.

not true, since the Bulgarian peoples had firmly settled several centuries before their official conversion in 865. The sermon is quoted again in connection with the peace treaty of 927 (the quotation is based on Uspenskij's translation):⁷⁴ "Die segensreichen Folgen des im Jahre 927 abgeschlossenen Friedens fanden in einer sehr farbenprächtigen Schilderung eines anonymen Redners aus jener Epoche ihren Ausdruck. 'Jetzt wurden die Erde und der Himmel reiner, und die Oberfläche der Erde bedeckte sich mit Blumen, jetzt geben sogar die Quellen mehr Wasser her, und die Erde und das Meer versehen uns reichlich mit ihren grösseren Geschenken; es ist, als ob in Wirklichkeit auch die Wipfel der Eichen mehr Eicheln spenden und die mittleren Zweige die Bienen nähren, die Herden tragen dickere Wolle, die Siedlungen breiten sich aus, die Menschen bauen Häuser, pflügen die Erde, setzen Pflanzen und säen Getreide, säubern die Gefäße von Spinnweben und durchkosten herrliche Hoffnungen; die Strassen füllen sich mit Reisenden und auf den Bergeshöhen spielen Lämmer und Kälber. Wie angenehm ist jetzt das Knarren der Wagen.... Jetzt werden die Kinder gross, und die Jugend arbeitet bis zur Ermüdung.... So wird alles jung und gibt sich der Freude hin und besingt und röhmt den Urheber dieses Segens.'" To point out the evils of war, the text of the sermon is once more quoted:⁷⁵ "Andere Schriftsteller berichten ausdrücklich, dass 'das Land ungebaut dalag, weil keine Leute zum Pflügen da waren, denn das ganze Land war unbewohnt.'"

In the historical literature of the years immediately following, no mention of the sermon is to be found. Then the Greek Byzantinist Nikos A. Bees (Vees) devoted to it a note in his study on the invasion of the Byzantine Empire by the Bulgarian Czar Symeon.⁷⁶ Without any solid arguments, the Russian scholar M. Šangin declared that the author of the sermon was the Archbishop Arethas of Caesarea.⁷⁷ Almost at the same time the eminent German scholar Franz Dölger, in his study on the Byzantine idea of "the family of princes and peoples,"⁷⁸ took into consideration, among other sources, our text. In it he finds expressed "das Verhältnis 'Sohn-Vater' sowohl zwischen dem byzantinischen Kaiser und dem jeweiligen Bulgarenherrschер als zwischen dem byzantinischen und dem bulgarischen Volke." He mentions Uspenskij's article and recalls that the latter had collected several illustrations of this idea, expressed by various Byzantine authors. But while Uspenskij had only cautiously advanced the suggestion that the author was Nicholas Mysticus, Dölger is in no doubt that the sermon was composed by this Patriarch. "Ausgabe der anonym überlieferten, mit Sicherheit aber dem Patr. Nikolaos zuzuschreibenden Rede auf den Frieden v. J. 924 [sic!]....," writes Dölger about

⁷⁴ Sakâzov, *op. cit.*, 35–36, 64.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 85.

⁷⁶ N. A. Bees, Αἱ ἐπιδρομαὶ τῶν Βουλγάρων ὑπὸ τὸν τιάρον Συμεὼν καὶ τὰ σχετικὰ σχόλια τοῦ Ἀρέθα Καισαρείας, in 'Ελληνικά, 1 (1929), 388–89.

⁷⁷ M. Šangin, "Vizantijskij pisatel' Arefa—avtor Slova o mire s bolgarami 927," *Istorik marksist*, no. 3 (73) (1939), 177.

⁷⁸ Dölger, "Der Bulgarenherrschер," 226 note 2, reprinted in *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt (supra*, note 25), 190 note 17.

Uspenskij's study.⁷⁹ Again, the "spiritual kinship" between Byzantium and the Bulgarians is the theme of another passage "aus der oben erwähnten Friedensrede d. J. 924." Where he detects an allusion to the conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity, Dölger remarks: "Es verdient Beachtung, dass der Patriarch, der, wie man sieht, durch den ständigen Hinweis auf das Vater-Sohn-Verhältnis, welches den Fürsten Symeon sowohl an ihn selbst (Nikolaos) als auch an den Kaiser bindet, ein pietätvolles Verhalten des ungebärdigen 'Kindes' erzwingen will, auch auf die allgemeinere und auf die 'Bruderschaft in Christo' anspielende Bezeichnung 'Bruder' (d.h. 'Bruder in Christo' nach Paulus) ausweicht, wohl um die Empfindlichkeit des stolzen Bulgaren zu schonen...."⁸⁰ Since he attributes the sermon to Nicholas Mysticus, Dölger must of necessity date it before the death of the head of the Byzantine Church, namely, to 924.⁸¹ He was wrong, however, in both instances.

In the first edition of his *Byzantinoturcica*,⁸² the Hungarian scholar Gyula Moravcsik repeats uncritically the same errors: "*Anonymus de Bulgaris*: eine anonym überlieferte kirchliche Rede aus dem 10. Jh. ist wichtig für die bulgarisch-byzantinischen Beziehungen. Neuerdings wurde nachgewiesen, dass ihr Verfasser der Patriarch Nikolaos Mystikos... war, und dass es sich in dieser Rede um den Friedensvertrag vom J. 924 handelt." After the publication of the first edition of *Byzantinoturcica*, I wrote to Moravcsik, pointing out that both the attribution of the sermon to Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus and the dating of the sermon were disproved by internal evidence. Therefore, in the second edition of his useful work,⁸³ the author modified his former statement as follows: "Wer ihr Verfasser war, wurde noch nicht endgültig geklärt. Man dachte an Nikolaos Mystikos..., an Arethas... und an Theodoros Daphnopates (Mitteilung von I. Dujčev), und es wurde dementsprechend angenommen, dass sich die Rede entweder auf den Friedensvertrag vom Jahre 924 oder auf den vom Jahre 927 bezieht." Evidently Moravcsik could not make up his mind one way or another. The very title he gives to this historical document betrays his reluctance to commit himself.⁸⁴ More bibliographical data was added to the note in question.

In 1963, I published in the series of Greek, i.e., Byzantine, sources for the history of Bulgaria in the Middle Ages the text of the sermon and its translation in Bulgarian, accompanied by an introduction and a commentary.⁸⁵ Four years later the important study of Romilly J. H. Jenkins appeared.⁸⁶ It is undoubtedly one of the most useful contributions to the solution of the

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, at beginning.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, at end.

⁸¹ Patriarch Nicholas I Mysticus died 15 May 925; see *supra*, note 54.

⁸² G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, I (Budapest, 1942), 110–11; cf. also 278.

⁸³ Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* (*supra*, note 10), 223–24.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 223: "Anonymus de Bulgaris."

⁸⁵ *Fontes Graeci Historiae Bulgaricae*, V (Sofia, 1963), 82–101.

⁸⁶ R. J. H. Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria (927) Celebrated by Theodore Daphnopates," *Polychronion. Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg, 1966); Reprinted in: *idem, Studies on Byzantine History of the 9th and 10th Centuries* (London, 1970), no. XXI (hereafter Jenkins "The Peace with Bulgaria"), 287–303.

problems arising from our text and, because of it, more historians were attracted to the sermon. After some preliminary words on Uspenskij's publication of 1894, Jenkins remarks: "Uspenskij's edition is unsatisfactory in every way but one: for it is only fair to say that his transcription of the text, written in a late 14th-century hand, is most accurate. But the meaning of the document—the allusions which it makes to contemporary events and personalities, the significance and date of its explanatory '*key*' (I mean, the marginalia), and indeed its very nature—almost wholly eluded him: and he himself very frankly admitted that this was so." Nevertheless Jenkins does not fail to note "the few occasions where he was right in his interpretation." Then he goes on, "But two of his misunderstandings must be observed at the outset. First, his title '*Tserkovnoe slovo*' is a misnomer. There is no reason to suppose, and every reason to doubt, that this is the text of a sermon for delivery in church. The wealth of classical allusion, and the constant, if covert, reference to contemporary politicians, would make the oration quite unsuitable for a thanksgiving in S. Sophia. The misunderstanding arises from a passage⁸⁷ in which the audience is exhorted to *go* to the church and give thanks for the peace." For Jenkins is convinced that "the oration is delivered by the official Palace orator in the presence of the emperor (Romanus I); and is comparable with the series of palace orations delivered before Leo VI by Arethas of Caesarea a quarter of a century before."

According to Jenkins, the second misunderstanding concerns the marginal notes of the manuscript: "In the second place, the 14th-century text includes, not only the title given above, in red ink, but also some highly illuminating marginal comments, partly in red ink and partly in black. These comments are a '*key*' to the identity of some of the persons disguised in the text under Biblical or mythological names." Jenkins believes that the dating of these notes proposed by the first editor of the text is wrong. "Uspenskij thought that these marginalia were additions of the 19th century, perhaps the work of Hase, who is known to have had access to the document. Hence, he thought himself free to doubt and even reject these identifications where he thought them improbable. But, in fact, these marginalia are in the same hand as the rest of the text [here, in a footnote, Jenkins refers to Mgr. Mercati, who pointed out this fact in 1919], and, what is more, are in every instance but one demonstrably correct. There can be little doubt that they go back to the 10th century and are perfectly reliable. We may add that Hase, good scholar as he was, would hardly have been capable of writing them."⁸⁸ This assertion, backed by the paleographical scrutiny to which the text was subjected by Mercati, is of particular importance for the accurate interpretation of our text.

The British Byzantinist warns, however, that, though the marginalia are of great help, "not... all the document's obscurities vanish before the eye of a modern scholar." After quoting Uspenskij's complaint about the difficulties

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 288 and note 3; the edition of Uspenskij is quoted (p. 64).

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 288.

the historian now has to cope with, he adds, reassuringly, "perhaps it is not quite so bad as all that." Then he proceeds to give a terse account of the results of his interpretation of the text: "Internal evidence shows that this oration was given in the Palace to celebrate the peace signed and ratified between Tsar Peter of Bulgaria and the Emperor Romanus I Lecapenus in October 927. Hence the oration itself may be dated to that month, or very shortly afterwards."⁸⁹ How much further than Uspenskij Jenkins has gone is quite evident. What he had in mind was to publish the complete text of the document; but in this article he says, "I cannot, for reasons of space, here republish the whole of it, though the whole deserves republication, in view of its importance and authorship and of the rarity of Uspenskij's edition. But I select the two passages in it which are of greatest importance to the historian, translate them and add some notes on their meaning, author and historical reliability."

He then gives the two passages of the Vatican manuscript with references to the editions of Uspenskij and Kurtz.⁹⁰ He proposes several corrections and *lectiones* in the text; he also identifies the sources of some quotations. The Greek text of the passages is followed by its English translation.⁹¹ In his *Comment*, Jenkins touches on the first passage only briefly: "The first passage (ὤ τῆς ἐπινοίας . . . χωρῆσαι τὸ μέγεθος) is by far the less important of the two, being merely a rhetorical celebration of the conclusion of the Peace of 927, of the repulse and death of Symeon of Bulgaria, and of the providential arrival of Romanus Lecapenus in 919, to redeem and unify the divided realm."⁹² Most of the same ideas are expanded in the second passage, where the Anonymous dwells on the historical change in the way of life of the Bulgarians. "The Bulgars, says the orator, are no longer to be called 'Scyths' and 'barbarians,' but once more Christians like ourselves. God has transformed the 'wolves of the West' (Bulgars) into 'cheerfulness.'" Again, God has intervened on behalf of the Byzantines, "He has caused the new Hadad or Holofernes [Symeon] to give place to his son Peter." Here Jenkins makes an interesting linguistic observation on "the usage of the *hapax προδιαμεθοδευσάμενος*," a word "which the orator, a hardy and daring innovator, has coined to imply 'having caused to move out of the way in front of': in other words, God has removed Symeon so that Peter can take his place." Similarly it is to divine will that the ascension of Romanus Lecapenus to the throne is attributed. Jenkins agrees with the identification of Solomon with the Emperor Leo VI and thinks that Jeroboam may stand for Leo Phocas. Uspenskij was unable to suggest any identification for Jonah, whereas, in Jenkins' opinion "...there is really no mystery about the matter. As Jonah was belched up from the sea to be the salvation of Nineveh (Jonah 2-3), so Admiral Romanus rose from the sea to the throne."⁹³

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 289.

⁹⁰ Uspenskij, "Neizdannoe cerkovnoe slovo," 67 line 8-70 line 2; 76 line 4-84 line 2 = Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria," 289-93.

⁹¹ Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria," 293-97.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 297.

⁹³ *Ibid.*

Further in the text Jenkins notes another reference to Romanus, who this time is called "Moses from the water."⁹⁴

Speaking of the marginalia, Jenkins accepts the identification of Hadad-Holofernes as Symeon. Regarding the identification of Jonah, Jenkins remarks that in one instance some indecision is betrayed by the author of the marginal notes, for he first identifies Jonah with Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, and then (this time correctly) with Romanus Lecapenus.

The second, and historically more important, passage of the sermon begins with a promise to explain the significance of the celebration of the peace of 927. The Anonymous turns back to the preceding historical period, namely, to the reign of the Emperor Leo VI, with a highly positive representation of this time. Achitophel, mentioned in the text, is possibly Samonas, the "trusty adviser" of Leo VI from 900 to 908,⁹⁵ while the identification of Draco and Solon, mentioned further in the sermon, remains problematical: "What specific law-givers, if any, lurk under the names of Draco and Solon," declares Jenkins, "does not appear."

In his further analysis, the explanation of the title *archon*, given to Symeon of Bulgaria, must be noted. "Symeon is here correctly styled *archon*, since at the outbreak of hostilities he was not yet crowned emperor."⁹⁶ With reference to a study by the late G. I. Brătianu,⁹⁷ he interprets the terms δῆμος and ἀποστασία as *insurrection* and *revolt*: Symeon "usurps an imperial crown and throne, the *crown that discrowned Europe*, that is, ruined the Balkan Peninsula and Thrace during the next eleven years." What is not clear in this statement made by Jenkins, is, first, the date of Symeon's usurpation of the imperial title and, second, the chronology of the Byzantine-Bulgarian wars. The first date is still controversial. Assuming for the end of hostilities the death of Symeon (27 May 927), the beginning of the war must be set—according to Jenkins⁹⁸—at about 916, which historically is not exact.⁹⁹ Jenkins interprets the term ἀνάρρησις in its "obvious and most common meaning," i.e., as a reference to the fact that Symeon proclaimed himself emperor; he seeks confirmation of this evidence given by the anonymous author in the letters exchanged between Romanus Lecapenus and Symeon¹⁰⁰ and in the inscriptions on Symeon's seals.¹⁰¹ In the next passage of the sermon Jenkins sees a descrip-

⁹⁴ On the Byzantine identification of the emperors in general with Moses, see A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin* (Strasbourg, 1936), 237; O. Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell* (Jena, 1938), 81, 130ff.

⁹⁵ On Samonas, see R. Janin, "Un arabe ministre à Byzance: Samonas," *EO*, 38 (1935), 308–10. L. Bréhier, *Vie et mort de Byzance* (Paris, 1947), 151ff.

⁹⁶ Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria," 298.

⁹⁷ For details, see G. I. Brătianu, "'Démocratie' dans le lexique byzantin à l'Empire des Paléologues," *Mémorial Louis Petit. Mélanges d'histoire et d'archéologie byzantines* (Bucharest, 1948), 32–40; *idem*, "Empire et 'démocratie' à Byzance," *BZ*, 37 (1937), 86–111; *idem*, "La fin du régime des partis à Byzance, et la crise antisémite du VII^e siècle," *Revue Historique du Sud-Est Européen*, 18 (1941), 49–67.

⁹⁸ Jenkins, *op. cit.*, 298.

⁹⁹ Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 375: beginning of the hostilities in 914.

¹⁰⁰ Bibliographical references, in Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 502–3. Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 485ff., 830ff., and *supra*, note 64.

¹⁰¹ For details, see I. Dujčev, *Medioevo bizantino-slavo. III. Altri saggi di storia politica e letteraria* (Rome, 1971), 185 note 6.

tion, "with much corroborative detail," of the "actual crowning of Symeon as emperor by the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus in September 913"¹⁰² (he accepts the interpretation of this event proposed by Ostrogorsky¹⁰³) and continues: "For obvious reasons, the utmost discretion had to be used by our orator. The transaction was so irregular and shameful that to name the principals, even though both were now dead, would have been—to put it mildly—unfortunate. Nor was it necessary to do so. The facts were known to all the audience, who would be quick to catch the allusions. Instead, the principals are referred to by a simple δ δε - δ δε - δ δε." Here Jenkins accuses Uspenskij of having proposed a wrong interpretation and consequently of having ended in "hopeless confusion."

The new interpretation of this passage suggested by Jenkins is very interesting and worth quoting *in extenso*. Proceeding from Ostrogorsky's explanation of the events of 913, he attempts to analyze the text from a new point of view. The allusions, he says, would have been easily comprehensible to contemporaries; the pronoun δ δε was used the first and the third time with reference to Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus, and the second time with reference to the Bulgarian Czar. Let us quote Jenkins;¹⁰⁴ "Nicholas, then, on Symeon's arrival, asks what his terms are, though in fact he knows them already.... Symeon wants the imperial crown. This has to be conceded, but how can it be made as '*unofficial*' as possible while still acceptable to Symeon? The first thing to do is to avoid the '*obeisance*' (προσκύνησις) due to an emperor from the second estate of the realm, the Roman Senate. So Nicholas takes good care that their representatives are excluded from the ceremony. He then goes to Symeon and crowns him with the black patriarchal *epirrihptarion*, which, bunched up into the semblance of an imperial *stemma*, is wittily described by our orator as the 'helmet of darkness.' But this is not enough for Symeon. He knows that '*obeisance*' is necessary for a proper coronation, and he goes on to demand this. Nicholas has foreseen this; and he makes it perfectly clear (σαφῶς ἔρῶν) that Roman senators (who, in any case, are not present) cannot make obeisance to any but a Roman emperor. 'No,' says he (and we are given what purport to be his exact words), 'Wear for a little the diadem which I have improvised for you, and let your fellow-celebrants do you obeisance.' This can only mean that the συνέορτοι ('fellow-celebrants') were Bulgarians, and that the title given to Symeon, or at all events understood by Nicholas to be given, was that of Βασιλεὺς Βουλγαρίας. That Symeon was '*tricked*' into accepting this is clear from the immediately following encomium on the tricks whereby the Patriarch cheated Symeon throughout his life; and also from the fact that, after his withdrawal to Bulgaria, Symeon renewed his demand for obeisance by Romans, and was again put off."¹⁰⁵ Here Jenkins points

¹⁰² Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria," 299.

¹⁰³ G. Ostrogorsky, "Die Krönung Symeons von Bulgarien durch den Patriarchen Nikolaos Mysticus," *IzvArhInst*, 9 (1935), 275–86.

¹⁰⁴ Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria," 299.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 299–300.

out that, although the term συνέορτοι is a *hapax*,¹⁰⁶ there is “no need to reject it,” as Uspenskij has done, for the term συνεορτάσσοντας appears in the correspondence of Nicholas Mysticus.¹⁰⁷

On the basis of this term συνέορτοι Jenkins further suggests that an attempt might be made to establish “where this peculiar coronation took place.”¹⁰⁸ According to a version of John Skylitzes and George Cedrenus,¹⁰⁹ which was accepted by Zlatarski, Ostrogorsky, and Dölger,¹¹⁰ Symeon himself was received inside the city of Constantinople, and the ceremony of the coronation took place in the palace of Blachernae. But Jenkins recalls that, according to the “older” version of the Logothete, only Symeon’s two sons were admitted in the City, while Patriarch Nicholas went out to meet the Bulgarian King at the Hebdomon.¹¹¹ In that case, it follows that the ceremony took place outside of Constantinople, with the assistance of a “mainly, if not wholly Bulgarian entourage.” And Jenkins adds: “It is equally certain that Nicholas would have preferred this, for obvious reasons.”¹¹² These reasons, of course, were chiefly those of security for the Byzantine capital. In support of this assertion, he reminds us that, when in 922 Symeon wanted to enter the City, he was given a very decided refusal, as Nicholas Mysticus reports.¹¹³ The positive result of these meetings was, as Jenkins remarks somewhat ironically, that “Symeon goes off home, after his peaceful enthronisation over his peaceful Bulgars.”

The sermon then goes on to describe the change in the relations between Byzantium and Bulgaria during the months immediately following. “This peaceable settlement was rudely overthrown by the palace-revolution of February 914, the expulsion of Nicholas from the regency, and the advent of Zoe’s new ‘government of eunuchs’ headed by Constantine the Chamberlain, here called ‘the new Proteus.’ This government denounced the secret agreement with Symeon...and prepared for war.” What comes next in the text is interpreted by Jenkins as an allusion to the war between the Byzantines and the Bulgarians in 917 and the defeat of the Byzantine army by Symeon in the battle at Achelo on August 20 of that year.¹¹⁴ The first editor of the text at this point failed to grasp the meaning of this passage, and Jenkins writes: “It is hard to understand how Uspenskij...could so totally have misunderstood this very obvious allusion; the orator should indeed have written παραστησαμένους for παραστήσαντας (as, lower down, he should have written

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 299 note 6.

¹⁰⁷ PG, 111, col. 201D.

¹⁰⁸ Jenkins, “The Peace with Bulgaria,” 300.

¹⁰⁹ G. Cedrenus-Joh. Skylitzes, Bonn ed., II (1839), 282 line 18.

¹¹⁰ Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 364ff. Ostrogorsky, “Die Krönung Symeons,” 276. Dölger, “Der Bulgarenherrscher als geistlicher Sohn des byzantinischen Kaisers,” reprinted in *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (*supra*, note 25), 192.

¹¹¹ On the Hebdomon, see N. P. Kondakov, *Vizantijskija cerkvi i pamjatniki Konstantinopolja* (Odessa, 1886), 198ff.

¹¹² Jenkins, “The Peace with Bulgaria,” 300.

¹¹³ PG, 111, col. 176A ff.; cf. Jenkins, “The Peace with Bulgaria,” 300.

¹¹⁴ For details, see Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 380ff.

συνθέμενος for συνθεῖς), but, apart from this solecism, his reference to the campaign and its commander is as plain as words can make it.”¹¹⁵

The passage which follows is interpreted by Jenkins¹¹⁶ as a narration of the ascension of Romanus Lecapenus to the imperial throne. The reference to the “Nazarenes agreeing” in the text is explained as expressing the approval of the Byzantine clergy: “All blessings instantly followed his elevation, among which we note ‘Nazarenes agreeing,’ in the Tomus Unionis of July 920.”¹¹⁷ The politics of the new Emperor are presented by the Anonymous as “a most versatile display of diplomatic activity” on the part of Romanus I Lecapenus. Jenkins declares that “the meaning of the awkward sentence τοῖς ποικίλοις... πολύτροπος is, the singleminded man may try any number of alternatives to achieve his aim (*‘that is what versatility means’*), whereas the ποικίλοι are unstable and have no singleness of purpose.”¹¹⁸ Thanks to other historical sources¹¹⁹ we know details of this wide diplomatic activity undertaken by the Emperor Romanus at the courts of Egypt and Bagdad, in Serbia, among the Russians, Petchenegs, Alans, Abasgians, and Magyars.

Jenkins recognizes that what follows in the sermon was correctly interpreted by Uspenskij as an allusion to the meeting of the Emperor with Czar Symeon on Thursday, 9 September 923;¹²⁰ and he is inclined to accept as a historical fact the author’s assertion that it was the Bulgarian ruler who began to speak and that he made “many errors in Greek diction and grammar.” The next day, September 10, having made a promise to negotiate for peace, Symeon left. But he did not keep his promise: “But as King David of old was not allowed by God to build His temple because he was a man of blood, for the same reason [the orator believes] Symeon was not allowed to do the holy work of peace-making, which has been reserved for his son Peter. Peter has come, and the treaty has been made....”

After thus recapitulating the contents of the sermon, Jenkins turns to two fundamental questions: first, that of the authorship of this work; and, second, that of the value of our text as a historical source.¹²¹ As regards the first question, he recalls that Uspenskij had “noted some similarities in the content and phraseology of our document with those of the Letters of the Patriarch Nicholas,” but had also seen the chronological discrepancy. This chronological discrepancy, says Jenkins, is “decisive against attributing the oration to Nicholas,” for the sermon was composed to celebrate the conclusion of the peace between Byzantium and the Bulgarians in October 927, while Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus had died in 925, that is, more than two years before.¹²² In

¹¹⁵ Jenkins, “The Peace with Bulgaria,” 300–1.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 301.

¹¹⁷ For details, see V. Grumel, *Les regestes des actes du patriarchat de Constantinople*. Vol. I. *Les actes des patriarches*. Fasc. 1. *Les regestes de 381 à 715*, Le patriarchat byzantin, Ser. 1 (Istanbul, 1932), 169–71, no. 669.

¹¹⁸ Jenkins, “The Peace with Bulgaria,” 301 note 14.

¹¹⁹ For details, see Zlatarski, *Istorija*, 430ff.

¹²⁰ For details, see *ibid.*, 468ff.

¹²¹ Jenkins, “The Peace with Bulgaria,” 301–3.

¹²² *Supra*, note 54. Grumel, *Les regestes*, 148.

addition to this, the Patriarch "himself is referred to, if not actually named . . . , in terms which make it nearly impossible that he can have been its author." Having thus rejected this hypothesis, Jenkins turns to the suggestion I had offered in my correspondence with Moravcsik: "Who then was [the Author]? The obvious person to think of is Theodore Daphnopates, the friend and *protosecretis* of Romanus I and the author of Romanus' letters to Symeon.¹²³ And indeed, according to Moravcsik,¹²⁴ I. Dujčev has already made the attribution." Here Jenkins reminds his readers that the editor of the correspondence of Romanus I Lecapenus, the Greek scholar John Sakkelion,¹²⁵ had advanced the hypothesis that Theodore Daphnopates was the author of Books I–IV and VI of the historical work generally known as Theophanes Continuatus. Sakkelion's suggestion is now generally accepted.¹²⁶ The Russian scholar S. Šestakov¹²⁷ tried to analyze the style of Theodore Daphnopates but, as Jenkins himself had pointed out in a previous article,¹²⁸ his "proofs were not quite convincing"; he now adds: "But the evidence of our oration, if Daphnopates wrote this too, goes far to confirm the hypothesis. . . ." He had already indicated that the Continuator of Theophanes wrote under the influence of Polibius and Plutarch; "It can scarcely be accident that, in our oration . . . the author says he can only explain the circumstances of the festival by 'presenting the occasions and causes, and whence and how those went before and these followed after.'"¹²⁹ A similar assertion in the text of Theophanes Continuatus is here quoted by Jenkins¹²⁹ who concludes, convincingly: "It is pretty clear that the same hand wrote both passages; and as Daphnopates has been put forward as the likeliest author of both these works, we can I think safely assume that he it was."

The second question, discussed briefly by Jenkins, is that of the chronology of our sermon.¹³⁰ He begins by raising the problem of "how reliable" this oration is "as a source, especially for the 'coronation' of Symeon in 913." The answer, according to him, is that "the author was a serious historian, and second, that he was addressing an audience all of whom, from the emperor downwards, knew the facts." He believes that the Anonymous "was certainly familiar with the Patriarch Nicholas' letters to Symeon, and may, as a younger man, have been a patriarchal secretary." This latter surmise is very interesting; it needs, however, further proof. But Jenkins does not stop here, but adds: "He [Theodore Daphnopates] may even, in that capacity, have gone with Nicholas to Hebdomon and been present at the 'coronation': at least, he purports to quote some actual words of Nicholas on that occasion."

¹²³ Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 540ff.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 223.

¹²⁵ Sakkelion, "Ρωμανοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ Λακαπηνοῦ ἐπιστολαι, 2 (*supra*, note 37), 39–40.

¹²⁶ Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 542.

¹²⁷ S. Šestakov, in *Actes du Deuxième Congrès International des Études Byzantines* (Belgrade, 1929), 35ff.

¹²⁸ Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria," 302. Cf. *idem*, "The Classical Background of the *Scriptores post Theophanem*," *DOP*, 8 (1954), 13ff., reprinted in *idem*, *Studies on Byzantine History of the 9th and 10th centuries* (London, 1970), no. IV, 13ff. See also M. Sjuzjumov, "Ob istoričeskom trudě Feodora Dafnopata," *Vizantijskoe Obozrenie*, II (Jur'ev, 1916), 295–302.

¹²⁹ Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria," 302.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 302ff.

At the end of his study Jenkins discusses Ostrogorsky's opinion on the description of the ceremony performed in 913, as given by the Byzantine orator, and says,¹³¹ "Ostrogorsky¹³² tends to cast doubt on the Chronicle's account of a 'sham' coronation, by which Symeon was tricked. He thinks that Symeon, the 'half-Greek,' could not have been so stupid as to be deceived into thinking that coronation with an *epirrhiptarion* was as good as one with a *stemma*. He believes that the 'trick' was invented *ex postfacto*, to invalidate a coronation that was perfectly in order." And he adds, "If we maintain this position, as we are still free to do, then Daphnophates, both here and in the Continuation of Theophanes, is merely giving the official version as it was told in 927. However, I am inclined to think there is more to it than that. The orator states that Nicholas practised his deceptions on Symeon throughout his life; and adds that, on this very occasion, he cheated Symeon out of a Roman obeisance. It does not seem wholly impossible that Symeon, who had probably never seen an imperial coronation, should have accepted the presence of the Ecumenical Patriarch, his prayer of consecration, and his imposition of some sort of head-gear, however ridiculous, as a valid procedure for his own elevation."

To conclude, Jenkins' study of 1966 represents undoubtedly one of the most valuable contributions to the analysis and interpretation of the anonymous sermon. Some of his conclusions on this historical source can be considered as final. First, it is clear that the author of our document was not the Patriarch of Constantinople, Nicholas I Mysticus, as was suggested by the first editor and uncritically taken up by some recent scholars. It follows that we must look elsewhere for the author of the work. The most likely person appears to be Theodore Daphnophates. But this hypothesis can be accepted as irrefutable only after a thorough analysis of all the historical and philological arguments, as I shall attempt to demonstrate in a special study.¹³³ Thanks to Jenkins' insistence that the sermon was pronounced on the occasion of the conclusion of the peace treaty between Byzantium and the Bulgarians in October 927, it is impossible to ascribe this work to Nicholas Mysticus. It is now also established that the marginal notes are not the work of an anonymous, later scribe but are contemporary with the original text. Thus, the identification of the different historical personalities mentioned in the text will become easier. Very valuable, too, are the many observations on the text suggested by Jenkins, as well as his translation, which is at the same time a useful interpretation.

Two years after the publication of Jenkins' study, the Belgian Byzantinist Mrs. Patricia Karlin-Hayter wrote an article about our document.¹³⁴ She begins by remarking, "We are once more in debt to Professor Jenkins for focusing attention, this time on a known but neglected source of tenth-century

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 303.

¹³² "Die Krönung Symeons" (*supra*, note 103), 278ff.

¹³³ "Notes sur l'activité littéraire de Théodore Daphnophate," to be published shortly.

¹³⁴ P. Karlin-Hayter, "The Homily on the Peace with Bulgaria of 927 and the 'Coronation' of 913," *JÖBG*, 17 (1968), 29–39.

history. The Ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν Βουλγάρων συμβάσει is neglected because of its obscurity. J. has, with dazzling brilliance, provided the crucial chaps. 11 to 17 with a translation and commentary. The solutions proposed for some of the main difficulties do not convince me. I have not always an alternative to propose, but as I draw, from my more fragmentary one, historical conclusions which are not possible with J.'s interpretation it is up to me at least to make clear how I reach them."

What are Mrs. Karlin-Hayter's objections to the interpretations and identifications given by Jenkins? First, the identification of Jeroboam, mentioned in the text, with the Byzantine general Leo Phocas. Mrs. Karlin-Hayter objects that "Jeroboam seems to be put on a level with Solomon, in other words to be an emperor. Same impression given by what follows, διὰ τὴν τῶν νεωτέρων βουλήν. It is the *emperor's* counselors one would expect to tear the flock. A suitable emperor is there, Alexander, Leo's brother and immediate successor accused elsewhere of superseding his brother's men by favorites of his own. This reference to the 'counsel of the young men' suggests that not Jeroboam but Rehoboam was meant. Rehoboam 'forsook the counsel of the old men, which they had given him, and consulted with the young men that were grown up with him and which stood before him' (I Ki 12,8)." The objection is worth considering.

The second observation made by Mrs. Karlin-Hayter concerns the titles given by the Anonymous to the Bulgarian rulers. She recalls¹³⁵ that, according to Jenkins, "Symeon is here correctly styled *Archon* since at the outbreak of hostilities he was not yet crowned emperor."¹³⁶ On this assertion she notes: "Nowhere in the homily have I found Symeon called βασιλεύς. The βασιλεῖς διχογνωμονοῦντας have made peace in the person of Peter, thus, whether the author of the homily gives Symeon different ranks at different dates or not, here the Bulgarian sovereign had to be βασιλεύς." In addition, she points out that Jenkins accepted Ostrogorsky's interpretation of the passage on Symeon's coronation,¹³⁷ and comments: "The passage is certainly of extreme interest, and there is no need to insist on the importance of the conclusions J. has drawn. One should not, however, forget that 'extreme discretion' means that identifying what is meant may be rather a subjective process, and, secondly, that Ostrogorsky's elucidation was rejected by Dölger."¹³⁸ Before attempting to give a better explanation of the passage in question, she first quotes it; then she proceeds to confute Jenkins: "My feeling is that the orator who, in an official oration in the presence of Romanus Lecapenus, described the patriarchal *epirrhiptarion* as a 'helmet of darkness' might find he had been too witty by half. Less sacred, perhaps, than imperial vestments, the patriarchal wardrobe was no subject for jokes except with the likes of Michael

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 29–30.

¹³⁶ Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria," 298.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 299.

¹³⁸ Dölger, "Bulgarisches Zartum und byzantinisches Kaisertum" (*supra*, note 25), 57–68, reprinted in *idem*, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt*, 140–58. Cf. also Dujčev, *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, III (*supra*, note 101), 183 note 3, with additional bibliographical references.

the Drunkard.”¹³⁹ Moreover, she does not agree with Jenkins that the third δέ refers to the Patriarch: “It is hard to imagine this being said of Nicholas in any circumstances . . .” That would be in contradiction with several passages of the homily conceived in praise of the Emperor Romanus Lecapenus. So it seems more likely that here the Emperor Leo VI is intended. “J. suggests that this sentence about honouring peace and being honoured by her applies to Symeon. Neither historically nor in the framework of the homily does he seem to me a possible candidate.”¹⁴⁰ Moreover, the expression of the Anonymous “the [imperial] brother” is interpreted by Jenkins as indicating Symeon; Karlin-Hayter finds this interpretation “surely a little strained.” However, she is not sure about the identification, for she declares: “the brother, whoever he may be, συναποίχεται leaving to the child [Constantine, by common consent] the sceptre and a regency council. . . .” Following her suggestion, we must accept the possibility that the Emperor Alexander is meant here, and that the “child” could only be the young Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. A’s regards the expression ὑφάψας (ἐφάψας) . . . προσμένουσαν, she has this to say: “with or without the proposed emendations, I admit that I do not see what the author is driving at, but I can discover no element here that helps or hinders identification.”¹⁴¹ Her conclusion then is that the first and third δέ indicate “the same person, Leo.” But she adds: “A serious obstacle to the identifications I propose would, it is true, arise if the homily said that *on Leo’s death* vainglory and ambition swept into the heart of the Archon. But in fact it simply says ‘Our affairs flourished once, under Leo, and all was happiness, but misfortune had to come and evil to prevail and at once the torrent of vainglory swept into the heart of the Archon.’ This is slightly different.”

Let us now look into Mrs. Karlin-Hayter’s analysis of the text. She finds “very attractive” emending the term συνέόρτους, found in the MS, to συνόρκους, as Uspenskij proposed. Jenkins, however, accepted the reading of the MS and translates: “called for fellow-celebrants and proposed the confirmation of the covenant.” To explain her interpretation of the text, Karlin-Hayter offers other considerations as well. The Bulgarian King Symeon demanded obeisance as emperor, as is evident from a letter of the Patriarch Nicholas.¹⁴² The fact that he turned to the Patriarch with this demand permits us to assume that he had made the same demand earlier of Emperor Leo: “Leo rejected it. But at the same time he managed to prevent war breaking out. In fact it did not break out under Alexander either.”

Speaking of the two studies on the problem of Symeon’s coronation in 913, that of G. Ostrogorsky and that of Dölger, she has some objections to make on several points. Of the two versions describing the event—that of Symeon Logothete (Greek text and Slavic translation) and that of John

¹³⁹ Karlin-Hayter, *op. cit.*, 30.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 31.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴² PG, 111, col. 57. Cf. Karlin-Hayter, *op. cit.*, 32.

Skylitzes—she finds that the latter is to be preferred as being “the most reliable” and “a coherent whole.” Comparing the two versions, she emphasizes the following: It is clear, first, that “Skylitzes depends for this period almost exclusively on the Logothete” but has tried to clarify the “obscurities” and so his account appears “more lucid.” In this passage, too, she says that the “broad basis is the Logothete chronicle.” Paying special attention to the difference between the Logothete and Skylitzes, she comes to the conclusion that “we are not in presence of two sources but of two variants of the same source. What did [the original source] say? That Symeon was introduced into the palace to eat with the emperor, or Symeon’s sons? It is, of course, impossible to give a certain answer, but I find the consistency of the earlier tradition, including the Slavic versions, impressive. And if Skylitzes is right, what happened to our older witnesses? Early enough to affect the various families of the text, Symeon fell out of the company admitted into the palace of Blachernae, through a scribe’s carelessness or a deliberate altering of the text. I insist on the text, because it is a common text that lies behind both variants, and one of them merely represents a deformation of it.”¹⁴³ This text is old, but not so old as to be dated with any likelihood to the time of Patriarch Nicholas. However this may be, two sure points have emerged from the previous discussion: “1. that we are not faced with two sources but with two variants of one source; 2. that one of these variants is met with exclusively in all the older families of the text [all those, at least, that are readily accessible], while the other is only represented by a very late tributary of a member of one of these families [Theophanes Continuatus].”

Having stated that foreign sovereigns very rarely were allowed to enter the Byzantine capital, especially during a period of war,¹⁴⁴ Mrs. Karlin-Hayter then raises the question of whether Symeon was admitted into Constantinople and wonders what hostages could be found to make him feel safe. Here she discusses the different hypotheses put forward by Zlatarski, Ostrogorsky, Dölger, and Jenkins on the subject of Symeon’s coronation.¹⁴⁵ As “corroboratory circumstances” to Dölger’s hypothesis, she notes that the “Slav Logothete twice refers to Symeon as *czar* . . . , thereafter reverting to *knjaz*.”

After mentioning that the Slavic translation of the Chronicle of the Logothete “is not earlier than 948,” Mrs. Karlin-Hayter declares that “his [i.e., the translator’s] sensitivity to titulature is both overprecise and not precise enough: he should not have used the title *before* the coronation. But on the other hand, why, if he was so precisely informed, did he not make the episode a little clearer for the interested Bulgarian reader? Because, I think, for him the term *czar* had a past, sketchily apprehended rather than precisely charted.”¹⁴⁶

I cannot agree with this explanation given by Mrs. Karlin-Hayter. When turning to the evidence of the medieval Bulgarian translation of the Chronicle

¹⁴³ Karlin-Hayter, *op. cit.*, 34.

¹⁴⁴ S. Runciman, *A history of the First Bulgarian Empire* (London, 1930), 156 note 3.

¹⁴⁵ Karlin-Hayter, *op. cit.*, 35.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 35–36.

of Symeon Logothete, especially to that concerning the ruler's titles, one must take into consideration the fact that this old Bulgarian translation dates from a later period, namely, from the fourteenth century. The translator, moreover, does not translate titles precisely but adapts his text in view of making it more accessible and comprehensible to his readers. Therefore, the evidence of the medieval Slavic translation of the Chronicle is, in this respect, only of limited value. It is also possible that it was a later copyist, and not the translator himself, who introduced certain changes in the official terminology. Thus, one must be very cautious in drawing conclusions based on these passages of the Chronicle in its Slavic translation.

As to Ostrogorsky's study, Mrs. Karlin-Hayter has this to object:¹⁴⁷ "It is suggested that there is a complete change in the tone of Nicolas' letters after August 913. This is perhaps a little misleading. In spite of the prayers and entreaties, the circumlocutions and confusion, and even the absence of the word *archon*, Nicolas' letter 8 is not a general lamentation on the insatiability of man, but another lesson on the impiety of trying to overthrow the order established by God and seize by violence titles and honours He has ordained for others...." After quoting several passages from this letter of the Patriarch, she concludes: "In short, one cannot prove that there was no coronation in 913, but no source says there was, only that Symeon would have liked one but got instead a benediction and a scarf laid on his head. The coronation is the imaginative interpretation of a cryptic remark, supporting evidence is doubtful while, on the other hand, there are undoubted objections to it."¹⁴⁸

Thus she refuses to believe that the passage describes the coronation of the Bulgarian ruler by the head of the Constantinopolitan Church and attempts to explain the significance of the ceremony in a different way. Turning to the interpretation proposed by Dölger, she is inclined to accept that here are "essential features of an official spiritual adoption,"¹⁴⁹ which is to be understood as the admission into the Byzantine "family of princes and peoples"; she leaves, however, other difficulties unresolved. After quoting a long passage of Dölger's study of the event, Mrs. Karlin-Hayter analyzes certain expressions of paragraph 13 and declares:¹⁵⁰ "[Paragraph] 13 alludes in my opinion to relations between Symeon and Leo VI. The 'helmet of Hades' is the usual metaphoric headgear, never inappropriate to Symeon. What lies behind the allusion to the Senate escapes me." In my opinion, Mrs. Karlin-Hayter's explanation is refuted by the well-known historical evidence. She affirms: "The actual information to be drawn from this part of the oration seems to be that already under Leo VI Symeon was claiming the title of βασιλεύς and asking for προσκύνησις from 'Ρωμαῖοι.'" After quoting the sentence that follows, "Ἡ βραχὺ τιθεὶς τὸ περινοηθέν σοι διάδημα προσκυνητὰς ἔχε τοὺς συνεόρτους, she goes on to explain: "[an] opposition, as Jenkins points out, between the προσκυνηταί he could not have, the 'Ρωμαῖοι, and those he could, described as his συνεόρτους."

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 36ff.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 37.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 38.

If we accept the hypothesis that Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus staged, in 913, a sham coronation of Symeon, the passage quoted by Jenkins would be clear. Also, the Bulgarian King was crowned, only briefly, not with the real imperial crown, but with a fake diadem and had as “worshippers” only those present at the ceremony, not the subjects of the Empire. The so-called “coronation” of Symeon is made to appear as a farce, or, at least, the Anonymous, together with some other Byzantine authors, tried to present *post factum* as a farce a ceremony which had actually taken place, with the intention of minimizing its real significance.

Mrs. Karlin-Hayter considers other points in the text of the sermon. She disagrees with Jenkins’ translation, “denouncing the secret agreement with Symeon,” which she thinks interprets too freely the Greek συκοφαντοῦντας τὰ τοῦ κράτους ἀπόρρητα; and as a matter of fact, the exact translation of this phrase is: “those who are denouncing the secrets of the Empire [or: of the Emperor].” As regards the interpretation of “those who played Jeremiah and Isaiah to him,” she quotes Jer. I:15–19 with its reference to the kingdoms of the North and the gates of Jerusalem. On the term παραστήσαντας (and also συνθείς) she notes:¹⁵¹ “This would deservedly lose a schoolboy a mark, but the author not only knows Greek but writes educated Greek with all the literary Byzantine’s excessive fondness for verbal tricks.” She reminds us further that the Anonymous uses “irreprochably” this expression at the end of paragraph 20, “so that a lapse so patent seems hardly possible.” And she adds: “Perhaps it is, on the contrary, a piece of wordplay whose subtlety escapes us.” Analyzing single terms and expressions, Mrs. Karlin-Hayter finds that “the account of the meeting between Symeon and Roman[us] is full of details that concord with the account of the chronicler.”¹⁵² As a parallel text she quotes only one passage from Theophanes Continuatus (ed. Bonn, 407 line 12ff.); but I should like to point out that the similarities are easy to explain if we accept that the author of both works—the Homily and this part of the *Continuatio Theophanis*—was one and the same person—that is, Theodore Daphnopates. She then quotes that phrase of our sermon where it is said that Symeon πολλὰ μὲν βαρβαρίων, πλείω δὲ σολοικίων.... This assertion of the Anonymous, she says, represents “perhaps a counterblast to the flattering term of ἡμιαργός applied to Symeon according to the Antapodosis” of Liutprand of Cremona. The contradiction between the two historical sources has been pointed out before; its explanation, however, is unconvincing. Is one to see here a rhetorical exaggeration, deliberately directed against the Bulgarian ruler, or is a different interpretation possible? Mrs. Karlin-Hayter suggests that “the barbarisms and solecisms could be moral ones: the low jokes with which Symeon began the interview” with Romanus Lecapenus, as is indicated by Nicholas Mysticus.¹⁵³ The first interpretation of this phrase, however, seems to me more likely.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵² *Ibid.*

¹⁵³ PG, 111, col. 189; cf. Karlin-Hayter, *op. cit.*, 39.

The suggestion concerning the translation of the phrase *εἰ γὰρ τὸ ἔξ Αἰγύπτου παραιτεῖται σιδήριον* is interesting: "For if He [God] rejects the iron from Egypt, how shall He rejoice in a bloody hand?"

Finally, let us quote the conclusion reached by Mrs. Karlin-Hayter as the result of her detailed and careful analysis: "The author of the homily has been the object of much speculation but never backed up by arguments as precise and solid as the two quotations produced by J. We can now hardly doubt that the author of books I–IV and VI of Theoph. Cont. is responsible for the homily, whether or not he was Daphnopates. J. writes: 'I thought Šestakov's proofs were not quite convincing: and I still think that, in themselves, they are not.' To them must now be added the suitability of Daphnopathes, 'the friend and protasekretis of Romanus I and the author of Romanus' letters to Symeon,' as author of the homily. J. seems to have built up a very strong case. This double identification is capital for assessing the reliability of the homily. Though differing considerably when it comes to its interpretation, I agree with J. that it is a source of a very high order, and I feel that detailed discussion can only further understanding of it."

The present study was begun some years ago; certain circumstances, however, delayed its publication. In the meantime there appeared a detailed article in Greek by the young Byzantinist Mrs. Alkmene Stauridou-Zafraka, under the title "The Anonymous Sermon 'On the Peace with the Bulgarians'."¹⁵⁴ This article deserves our special attention. In the introductory part Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka endeavors to throw new light on some fundamental problems concerning the anonymous work. She begins by describing Codex Vat. gr. 483, which contains the sermon. Relying on Uspenskij and Devreesse, she offers only a few general indications. The notes made by Hase in the Bibliothèque Nationale¹⁵⁵ are known to her, it seems, only indirectly, through Uspenskij's reference. On the marginal glosses to the text of the sermon, she agrees with Jenkins that they were written by the copyist of our text, hence, that they date from the thirteenth–fourteenth century; they could have been copied from an older protocopy, but in no case could they have been written by the author of the sermon itself.

As to the date of this literary work Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka believes that the correct one is the almost generally accepted date 927, when the Byzantine Empire and Bulgaria concluded the peace treaty. She discusses further the question whether the sermon was in fact delivered in public or not. According to Jenkins it was pronounced in the imperial palace, while Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka subscribes to Uspenskij's opinion that it was delivered in one of the churches in Constantinople.

The most important problem, however, is that of the authorship of the sermon, and Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka analyzes the four main hypotheses put forward in the studies in which the matter is discussed and in which the

¹⁵⁴ A. Stauridou-Zafraka (Zaphraka), 'Ο Ἀνώνυμος λόγος "Ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν Βουλγάρων συμβάσει,"' *Βυζαντίνα*, 8 (1976), 345–406.

¹⁵⁵ *Supra*, note 7.

sermon is variously attributed to: 1. the Patriarch of Constantinople, Nicholas Mysticus; 2. the patrician Nicetas Magistros; 3. Arethas; 4. the writer Theodore Daphnopates. After a careful analysis she rejects all the suggestions made by previous scholars. The authorship of Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus is improbable because of chronological incongruity: if we accept 927 as the date of the sermon, the Patriarch, who died in May 925, could not have been its author; moreover, no convincing linguistic and stylistic analogies can be traced between the letters of Nicholas Mysticus¹⁵⁶ and the sermon. It was the French Byzantinist J. Darrouzès, who came to the conclusion that the author of the sermon must have been the patrician Nicetas Magistros, a close relative of the Emperor Romanus I Lecapenus.¹⁵⁷ The literary activity of Nicetas is fairly well known: he wrote in all probability the Life of Saint Theoctiste of Lesbos¹⁵⁸ and thirty-one epistles.¹⁵⁹ However, when about 927 Nicetas Magistros was suspected of treason, he lost the favor of the Emperor and was exiled. The author of the sermon was in all likelihood a person of importance in Constantinople toward the end of 927 or the beginning of 928, when the sermon was delivered, so he could hardly be identified with a man who at that very time was suspected of plotting against the Emperor and had fallen in disgrace. In any case, Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka characterizes briefly the correspondence of Nicetas as being essentially different from the style and contents of our text.

Neither does Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka find convincing the hypothesis advanced by the late Russian Byzantinist M. Šangin¹⁶⁰ that the author of the sermon was the Metropolitan of Caesarea, Arethas. She completely agrees with L. G. Westerink's statement that there is "*in ea [oratione de pace] nihil quod Arethae proprium sit.*"¹⁶¹

Finally she subjects to criticism the hypothesis, first proposed by me and accepted as correct by Jenkins, Mrs. Karlin-Hayter, and Westerink, that the author of the sermon was Theodore Daphnopates. After giving some biographical data on this Byzantine personage, she concludes that the arguments offered in favor of this theory are not sufficient. The comparative analysis of Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka is restricted to analogies between the vocabulary and phraseology of the sermon and the correspondence of Theodore Daphnopates on the one hand, and the works of Arethas and the text of the so-called Theophanes Continuatus on the other.¹⁶² In spite of the fact that the analogies with the works of Arethas are, in her opinion, more numerous as

¹⁵⁶ For the new critical edition of the Greek text and the English translation by R. J. H. Jenkins and L. G. Westerink, see *supra*, note 30. Cf. Stauridou-Zafraka, *op. cit.*, 351–52.

¹⁵⁷ J. Darrouzès, "Inventaire des épistoliers byzantins du X^e siècle," *REB*, 18 (1960), 126. Cf. Stauridou-Zafraka, *op. cit.*, 352–53.

¹⁵⁸ BHG³, ed. F. Halkin, II, 270, nos. 1723–24.

¹⁵⁹ Nicétas Magistros, *Lettres d'un exilé (928–946)*, ed. and trans. L. G. Westerink (Paris, 1973).

¹⁶⁰ See *supra*, note 77. Cfr. Stauridou-Zafraka, *op. cit.*, 353ff.

¹⁶¹ L. G. Westerink, *Arethae scripta minora*, II, Teubner (1972), p. ix ff. Cf. Stauridou-Zafraka, *op. cit.*, 353ff.

¹⁶² Stauridou-Zafraka, *op. cit.*, 358ff.

compared to those with the works of Theodore Daphnopates and "Theophanes Continuatus," she has to admit that there is no sufficient evidence for attributing the authorship to Arethas with any certainty.

At the end of her analysis Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka comes to the conclusion that to none of the above-mentioned writers could the authorship of the sermon be ascribed. So she goes back to the first editor of the sermon, Uspenskij, who preferred to consider it an anonymous work and whose opinion Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka shares—as indeed she clearly implies in the very title of her study.

"Within the text of the sermon," writes Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka, "one finds only a few allusions to the author's personality; moreover, they are often obscure." If we accept as concrete and reliable the allusions in paragraph 3, then it follows that the author of this literary work was "a member of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, that he was connected with the imperial court, and that he belonged to some literary circle."

Next, she concisely examines the contents of the sermon,¹⁶³ emphasizing the moments which are most significant from a historical point of view. The complete text is then reproduced,¹⁶⁴ and identifications of the quotations and allusions are given, together with the *variae lectiones* from the Vatican MS and previous editions of the text, and the proposed emendations (especially those of Kurtz and Jenkins). Compared with the text established by Jenkins and myself and given in the present edition, the divergencies are only few. As to the identification of the numerous quotations and allusions, Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka is able to enrich here and there the indications of the previous editions, thanks especially to some more recent publications. Of particular interest is her commentary to the text,¹⁶⁵ which is examined from a historical and philological angle. Certain interpretations and explanations differ from, and sometimes are even the opposite of, our own.

Considering all the publications we have discussed, especially after the study of Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka, one might well question the necessity of a new edition of the sermon. But to my mind not all problems connected with this literary work have been definitively solved; not all doubts have been cleared. To begin with, it is necessary to bring out fully the importance of our text as a historical and literary document connected with some decisive events in the life of the Byzantine Empire during the tenth century. It must be admitted that the accurate interpretation of the contents of this literary work is particularly difficult. The author of the oration does not express his thoughts in simple language, as is the case with other Byzantine writers, but resorts to allusions, images, and vague indications, which no doubt were intelligible to his listeners who were contemporaries with the events alluded to. Today's scholars flounder in the midst of the rhetorical language.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 360–62.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 363–80.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 380–404.

The text as presented by Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka is satisfactorily edited. But to her study, which is published in Greek, a translation of the sermon in one of the more commonly known modern European languages should have been added. This omission is redressed by the English translation made by the late Romilly Jenkins which is included in the present edition. The bibliographical data of Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka is incomplete, various contributions on the subject were either not known or inaccessible to her. This fact must necessarily have had some influence on the author in limiting her grasp of the problems concerning the oration.

There is no need to repeat here the arguments against the attribution of the work to Nicholas Mysticus, Nicetas Magistros, or Arethas of Caesarea, for this was briefly but convincingly disposed of by Mrs. Stauridou-Zafraka. But then who among the other writers of the first half of the tenth century was the most likely author of this sermon? In all probability this writer was Theodore Daphnopates. Let us recall what we know about the main facts of his life. The dates of his birth and death are not known. What is known is that he lived during the reign of the Emperor Romanus I Lecapenus (920–44) or, rather, of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913–59) and his son Romanus II (959–63), and that he occupied an important position in the civil hierarchy. During the initial years of the reign of Romanus I Lecapenus, in all probability in 925, Theodore Daphnopates was appointed *mystikos* (confidential secretary) to the Emperor, with the honorary title of *magistros*. While in this office, he wrote a number of official letters in the name of the Emperor. It is accepted by scholars that the letters of Romanus I Lecapenus addressed to the Bulgarian Czar Symeon between the years 925 and 926¹⁶⁶ were actually written by Theodore Daphnopates:¹⁶⁷ "Diktat: Theodoros Daphnopates" (Dölger); "Verfasst wahrscheinlich von Theodoros Daphnopates" (Moravcsik). We know, moreover, that Theodore Daphnopates composed some literary works. In all probability he is the author of a Life of St. Theodore the Studite.¹⁶⁸ He also composed a selection of the sermons of St. John Chrysostom.¹⁶⁹ Further, to him is attributed Book VI of "Theophanes Continuatus," which contains the history of Byzantium under the Emperor Leo VI (886–912), his brother Alexander (912–13), Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, and Romanus I Lecapenus, and includes also the first years of the reign of Romanus II. This comprises the period from 886 to 963. He was probably also the editor of the entire "Theophanes Continuatus."¹⁷⁰ Some

¹⁶⁶ For bibliographical references, see Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 502–3.

¹⁶⁷ Dölger, *Regesten* (*supra*, note 9), 74–75, nos. 606–608. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 502. Cf. also D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe, 500–1453* (London, 1971), 116: "The Bulgarian peace treaty of 927 was celebrated in an oration delivered in the same year in the palace, probably by Theodore Daphnopates, a high imperial official and the author of Romanus' letters to Symeon."

¹⁶⁸ BHG³, II, 279, no. 1755.

¹⁶⁹ S. Lambros, in *Neos Hellenomnemon*, 1 (1904), 186. Stauridou-Zafraka, *op. cit.*, 354. For other references on the literary activity of Theodoros Daphnopates, see Beck, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 10), 552–53, 551, 484. Krumbacher, 151 § 3, 161, 170, 348, 367, 399, 459. Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus* (*supra*, note 24), 2.

¹⁷⁰ Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 540 ff.

scholars even go so far as to consider him the author of Books I–IV of that work.¹⁷¹ As Jenkins pointed out,¹⁷² it is possible to find many analogies between the text of "Theophanes Continuatus" and those works whose author is beyond all doubt Theodore Daphnopates. As I have mentioned above, it is my hope to publish in the near future a special comparative linguistic study in support of the claim that Theodore Daphnopates is indeed the author of the sermon.

¹⁷¹ Cf. Stauridou-Zafrafa, *op. cit.*, 354 and note 45. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 542ff.

¹⁷² Jenkins, "The Classical Background of the *Scriptores post Theophanem*" (*supra*, note 128), 13ff.; reprinted in *idem*, *Studies* (*supra*, note 128).

SIGLA

V — Cod. Vatic. gr. 483, fols. 43–51
 Jk — corr., con. Jenkins
 Me — corr. Mercati

Du — corr. Dujčev
 Ku — corr. Kurtz
 Us — legit, corr. Uspenskij

ΕΠΙ ΤΗΙ ΤΩΝ ΒΟΥΛΓΑΡΩΝ ΣΥΜΒΑΣΕΙ

1. Εἰρήνην ὑμνοῦμεν, εὐφράνθητε· εἰρήνην ἀφ' ὑψους,¹
 σκιρτήσατε· εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις Σιών,² αἱ θυγατέρες Ἱερουσαλὴμ³
 συγχορεύσατε. ἀλαλάξατε συμφώνως πᾶσα πνοή·⁴ ὅσοι τε χθὲς ἔτρυχό-
 5 μεθα, καὶ ὅσοι σήμερον ἀνεκλήθητε· ὅτι προσέσχεν εἰρήνη τοῖς ὑπομέ-
 νουσιν αὐτὴν καὶ εἶδεν ἰδοῦσα τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς· ὅτι εὐδόκη-
 σεν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ταπεινῶν προσευχὴν καὶ τοὺς ἐν ἀθυμίᾳ πεπεδημένους
 ἔβρύσατο. ὁ αἰθὴρ σταλαξάτω γλυκασμόν,⁵ καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ ἀγαλλίασιν,⁶
 καὶ νάπαι καὶ ποταμοὶ συγκροτείτωσαν.⁷ ὅτι ὁ πόλεμος πεπολέμωται
 10 καὶ νενίκηται, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶν ἀνάστημα καὶ ὑψωμα γῆς κατὰ τῆς ἔχθρας
 ἵστανται τρόπαια. εἴ τις φιλόνεικος,⁸ εἴ τις φιλαίτιος, ἐκχωρείτω· ἀνέστη
 γάρ εἰρήνη καὶ διασκορπισθήτωσαν οἱ ἔχθροι αὐτῆς, καὶ κηροῦ δίκην
 ἐκ πυρὸς ἐκλιπέτωσαν⁹ οὐ γάρ μὴ θεάσηται δόξαν εἰρήνης ὅμμα βάσκα-
 νον,¹⁰ ἡ ὑπὲρ τὸν Σεδεκίαν ἀμαυρωθήσεται.¹¹ ὅρα μοι τὰς φαρέτρας ὁ
 15 βλέπων εἰς ἄροτρα, καὶ τὰς ζιβύνας εἰς δρέπανα, καὶ πρόσθες, καὶ γάρ
 ἐν πνεύματι, ὅτι οὐ μὴ μάθωμεν ἔτι πολεμεῖν.¹² ἡ νύξ κατὰ τὸν εἰπόντα
 προέκοψε, καὶ αὕτη ὡς ἐωσφόρος λελουμένος ἀφ' ὑδάτος προέκυψε τὸν
 δρίζοντα.¹³ ἐπειχθῶμεν πρὸς τὴν λάμψιν αὐτῆς καὶ τῷ φωτὶ αὐτῆς
 20 ὑπαντήσωμεν. ὅτι ζωὴ ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτῆς καὶ τῇ ἀριστερᾷ εὐλωΐα
 προτείνεται, ἀπὸ διαδήματος αὐτῆς εὐφροσύνη καὶ ἡ φθογγὴ αὐτῆς
 θανάτου κατάλυσις.

2. Ποῦ μοι τοσοῦτον, ἡ θεία καὶ κλήσει καὶ πράγματι,
 προδιέτριβες; ποῦ μοι δίχα τῶν σῶν συνεδρίαζες; ἡ καὶ σὺ λευκοῖς
 καλυψαμένη χιτῶσιν, ὡς λέγουσιν, ὅτι τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν μίσος ἐμίσησας,
 25 ἀνεπτερύξω πρὸς Ὀλυμπον;¹⁴ ὑπὲρ τὸν ἐκ τρικυμίας ὅρμον ἐφιλήθης
 ἡμῖν, ὑπὲρ τὸν ἐκ χιόνος ἀνέφελον ἥλιον. ὅσον ἐμάκρυνας ἀφ' ἡμῶν καὶ
 ηὐλίσθης ἐκκλίνασα ἡ Ἀκεσίου σελήνη,¹⁵ καὶ οὐδαμοῦ τὰ ἡμέτερα ὁ

2–3 Εἰρήνην ὑμνοῦμεν...σκιρτήσατε VMeJk: Εἰρήνη ἀφ' ὑψους,
 σκιρτήσατε. εἰρήνην ὑμνοῦμεν, εὐφράντητε Us || 4 χορεύσατε Us ||
 5–6 ὑπομένουσι Us || 16 πολεμεῖν corr. Jk: πολέμων Us

¹ Cf. Eccl. 12:5.

⁸ Ez. 3:7.

² Num. 21:26–28; Jos. 13:10.

⁹ Ps. 67:2–3.

³ Cant. 2:7; 3:5, etc.

¹⁰ Cf. Deut. 28:54–56; Sir. 14:8.

⁴ Ps. 65:1; 97:4; 150:6.

¹¹ Jer. 52:11.

⁵ Amos 9:13; Joel 3:18.

¹² Cf. Is. 2:4.

⁶ Ps. 64:13.

¹³ Cf. Homerum, Il. 5.5–6; 23.226–28.

⁷ Ps. 97:8.

¹⁴ Hesiodus, Op. 197–200.

¹⁵ Diogenianus Epicur. I.57; Suidas, *Suidae Lexicon* T 512 (ed. Adler, III, 541); cf. E. L. Leutsch et F. G. Schneidewin, *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* (Göttingen, 1839; reprint, Hildesheim, 1965), I, 189–90.

THE TREATY OF 927 WITH THE BULGARIANS 255

ON THE TREATY OF THE BULGARIANS

1. We sing of peace, and be ye glad! Of peace from on high, and do ye leap for joy! Peace upon the cities of Sion, and do ye dance together, ye daughters of Jerusalem! Let all that have breath cry aloud in unison, as many of us as were yesterday afflicted and are redeemed today: forasmuch as peace hath regarded them who waited upon her, and hath seen with her eye the tribulation of her people: forasmuch as she hath approved the prayer of the humble and delivered those that were fettered in despondency! Let the sky distil sweetness and the mountains joyfulness, let the vales and rivers clap their hands together; forasmuch as war has been warred upon and defeated, and upon every rising and elevated ground stand trophies erected over enmity. If there be any lover of strife, any contentious man, let him stand away: for peace has arisen, and let her enemies be scattered and be melted like wax by the fire: for the eye of envy shall not behold the glory of peace or that eye shall be dimmed more than Zedekiah. See with prophetic eye our quivers turned into ploughshares and our spears into sickles, and add, in spiritual exaltation, "we will no longer learn to make war!" The night, in the poet's words, is far advanced, and she, like Lucifer bathed in the waters, has emerged above the horizon. Let us hasten toward her brightness and salute her light, forasmuch as life is proffered in her right hand and prosperity in her left, cheerfulness shines from her diadem, and her voice is the doing away of death.

2. Where, o holy one in name and deed, hast thou tarried so long until now? Where hast thou sat in counsel apart from thine own? Or didst thou, clad, as they say, in white garments, fly up to Olympus, because thou hatedst the hatred among us? Thou wast loved by us above the haven from the tempest, above the sun undimmed by snow clouds. For so long as thou wast far from us and dwelledst apart like the blue moon of Akesios, and our state

Ed. Note: The reader will find a few minor discrepancies between this translation and the text. These occur because the late Romilly J. H. Jenkins finished his translation before Professor Dujčev completed his critical edition.

Ἐνδυμίων ἔξ ὑπνου¹⁶ καὶ τῷ αὐχμῷ [ἐ]πιελόμεθα· μετὰ Στέντορος εἶχον εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀδόμενον, καὶ τῷ Κροίσου παιδὶ¹⁷ συνεσίγησα μετὰ τοῦ ἐν 30 Δωδώνη χαλκείου,¹⁸ καὶ ἵχθυνων ἀφωνότερος¹⁹ γέγονα. καὶ γάρ τῷ Ἱακὼβ συνήληγησα τὴν ψυχὴν²⁰ καὶ ποταμοὺς δακρύων²¹ κατήγαγον. οὐ τὸν χιτῶνα διεψευσμένοις λύθροις ἴδων, οὐδὲ τὸν ζῶντα νεκρὸν ὀδυρόμενος, οὐδὲ πιστεύσας τοῖς ἀπατῶσιν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς πεποθημένους αὐτούς, τοὺς ἀθρόους, τοὺς ἀναιτίους διατετμημένους ὄρῶν καὶ μεμο- 35 λυσμένους ἐν αἴματι. ναὶ δὴ καὶ τῷ Ἱερεμίᾳ²² συγκέχυμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ συντετάραγμαι τὰς τῆς Σιών θυγατέρας²³ τεθεαμένος, τὰς τιμίας, τὰς ἀπειθεῖς, τὰς οἰον ἀστέρας καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς διαστραπτούσας τοῖς πέρασι, τὴν προτέραν περιηρημένας εύπρεπειαν, ἀπημφιεσμένας τὸν ἔαυτῶν κόσμον καὶ κειμένας πτῶμα αὐτῶν τε τῶν προφητικῶν καὶ τῶν Ἡρακ- 40 λείτου τοῦ ξένου²⁴ δακρύων ἐπάξιον. οἵμοι δτὶ γέγονε καὶ πάλιν ἡ γῆ ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος εἴτε τῶν ὀρώντων ἀπόντων — ἀοίκητον γάρ ἀπαν οἰκούμενον οὔτω τῆς Λωῆς τῷ θειανάτῳ καταποθείστης — εἴτε τῆς πάλαι κατασκευῆς ἀποσκευασθείστης τῷ παμφάγῳ πυρὶ²⁵ καὶ τοῖς πέλυξιν, ὃς μηδὲ γινώσκειν ἡμᾶς ὅπῃ γῆς ἐσμεν καὶ ὅποι βαδίζομεν. οἷς 45 ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἔγώ καίτοι τῆς περιχαρείας ἥδη καλῶς ἐνδημούστης σκοτοδινῶ καὶ ἡλλοίωμαι καὶ τοῦ πάθους οὐκ ἐπανέρχομαι.

3. Ἡ γάρ ὑπερβολὴν ἀνίσις τὰ πραχθέντα καταλιμπάνει· τείχη κατηδαφισμένα, ναοὶ πυρακτούμενοι, χαρακτῆρες θεῖοι φλεγόμενοι, ἰλαστήρια κατερρίμενά, Ἱερεῖς αὐτῷ τῷ ἐφούδε²⁶ ἀπαγόμενοι, κειμήλια θεῖα συλούμενα, κῶμαι καὶ χῶραι κατεστραμμέναι, καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις πολιά καταικιζομένη, ἄωρος θεριζομένη νέοτης, παρθένων αἰδῶς ἀναιδῶς ἔλκομένη, τὸ συγγενὲς διχαλόμενον, καὶ συνόλως εἰπεῖν, τὰ θητησιμαία τῶν ὁσίων Κυρίου κυστὶ καὶ κόραξιν ἐλώρια κειμένα.²⁷ τῆς

28 post ἔξ ὑπνου lac. susp. Jk || 36–37 τὰς τιμίας... ὀφθαλμοὺς V:
τὰς τε βίας τὰς ἀπειθεῖς... ὀφθαλμοὺς leg. Us τοῖς βιασταῖς ἀπειθεῖς
τὰς οἰον ἀστέρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς corr. Us || 37 διαστραπτούσας V:
διαστραφείσας coni. Jk || 40–41 ἡ γῆ ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος
εἴτε τῶν ὀρώντων VKu: ἀνήροτος... τῶν ἀρούντων coni. Us ||
41 εἴτε τῶν: ἥτε τῶν leg. Us || 53 ἐλώρια corr. Us: ἐλώρια V

¹⁶ Zenobius III.76: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 75. ¹⁷ Herodotus I.34.

¹⁸ Homer, Il. 5.785–86; Zenobius VI.5: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 162 et D. K. Karathanasis, *Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten des Altertums* ... (Munich, 1936), 49–50.

¹⁹ Theoph. Cont. (Bonn. ed.), 102, 13; I. Dujčev, Iz starata būgarska knižnina (Sofia, 1944), II, 310.

²⁰ Gen. 37:24–35.

²² Jer. 9:1.

²¹ Cf. Lam. 2:18; Dujčev, SBN, 4 (1935), 135.

²³ Is. 3:16.

²⁴ The Greek philosopher of the sixth century B.C.; E. Wellmann, RE, VIII, coll. 504–8: “als ewig weinenden Philosophen”; Lucianus, *Vitarum auctio* 14.

²⁵ Euripides, *Medea* 1187.

²⁶ Cf. I Regn. 14:3.

²⁷ Cf. III Regn. 20 (21):24; IV Regn. 9:10, 36; Lucianus, *Tim.* 8.

knew, like Endymion, no awakening, and we were crushed down in squalor, then was I like one who speaks — as the proverb says — with Stentor, then was I silent as the son of Croesus with the gong of Dodona and became more voiceless than fishes. For I was grieved in soul like Jacob and shed tears in rivers. The garment I saw was defiled with no imaginary filthinesses; the dead whom I bewailed was no living man; they were no deceivers in whom I put my trust. It was my beloved ones themselves, the innocent, the harmless, whom I saw quartered and befouled with blood. Yea, and with Jeremiah I was confused and troubled in spirit at sight of the daughters of Sion, the honorable, the inflexible, their starry eyes contorted in every direction, shorn of their former modesty, stripped of their decent apparel, and lying corpses which would have moved the tears of the prophet or of the pagan Heracleitus. Alas that the land should once more lie uncared for and untilled, either because there was no one to care for it (for the whole habitation was uninhabited, so completely had life been swallowed up by death), or else because its former instruments had been ruined by all-devouring fire and axes, so that we could not even recognize in what region we were or whither we were going: at which, even now that joy has fairly come to dwell with us, I faint and turn pale and cannot put off my grief.

3. In truth, what has been done leaves behind it an excess of anguish: walls demolished, temples burnt, holy pictures devoured by fire, sanctuaries thrown down, priests in their ephods carried away, holy treasures plundered, villages and towns destroyed: nay, what is more, old age tormented, unripe youth a prey to the sickle, virgin modesty abducted without shame, families disrupted, and, in general, the corpses of the Lord's holy ones lying a prey to dogs and

fol. 44

παραπληξίας, τῆς σκοτομήτης, τῆς τῶν δρώντων ἀναλγησίας, τῆς
 55 ἀλγεινῆς τῶν πασχόντων κακώσεως. τὸ χείρον ἔτι, ὅτι μὴ ἀλλογενεῖς
 ἀλλοφύλοις μηδὲ ἀλλογλώσσοις ἀλλόγλωσσοι, υἱοὶ δὲ πατράσι καὶ
 ἀδελφοῖς ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες υἱοῖς ἀντέστημεν, ἐπανέστημεν. τούτοις,
 εἰ χρὴ κατὰ τὸν Ἀσκραῖον²⁸ εἰπεῖν, ἐπαχνώθη μοι φίλον κῆρ καὶ σίδηρον
 60 διῆλθε, τὸ τοῦ ψάλλοντος,²⁹ ἡ καρδία μου, ὡς μὴ θέλειν ἔτι με ζῆν καὶ
 δρᾶν τὴν ἡλίου φαιδρότητα· ὅτι δίχα νόσου νοσοῦμεν ἀνίατα καὶ δίχα
 παρακοπῆς παρακόπτομεν, καὶ δίχα τῆς Αἰγυπτίων ἀχλύος | ἀχλυού-
 μεθα χείρονα.³⁰ καὶ νῦν δὲ Ἰσραὴλ Ἰούδας καὶ Ἐφραὶμ ἔγενόμεθα,³¹ καὶ
 διειλόμεθα τὴν οὐσίαν ἀμφότεροι, καὶ οἱ φίλοι καὶ οἱ πλησίον ἔχθρῶν
 ἀσπόνδων γεγόναμεν ἀσπονδότεροι. καὶ ταῦτα δόξης προσκαίρους καὶ
 65 στεφάνου χάριν ἐνὸς καὶ τούτου περιττοῦ τίνος καὶ ἀκαίρου, ὑφ' οὐ τὸ
 πᾶν ἄνω καὶ κάτω δεδόνηται. ὑφ' οὐ καὶ νῦν δὲ δόλοις τε καὶ μεθόδοις
 μόλις τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀπατήσας καὶ τῆς Ἐδὲν ἀποστήσας τῆς
 οἰκουμένης ἀπονητὶ κατωρχήσατο.³² τούτοις διεκόπην ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἰλιγ-
 γιῶντα τὸν λόγον καὶ ἡ γλῶσσά μου τῷ λάρυγγί μου κεκόλληται.³³
 70 δτι συνῆκα καὶ κατενόησα ἢ μὴ ὠφελε, μήτε διανοθῆναι, μήτε γενέσθαι.
 καὶ ὥσπερ τὰ ἔμφωλεύοντα τῶν ζώων ταῖς ὁπαῖς διὰ τὸν κρυμὸν
 συστελλόμενα τὸ πᾶν δαπανῶσι καὶ ἐκπιέζουσιν ἔως ἡρινὴ διαυγάσει
 ἡμέρα, οὔτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσωθεν οἶον εἰπεῖν ἔμαυτὸν κατεδήδοκα. ἐντεῦθεν
 75 δημητηρίας, βασιλείους σκηνάς, ἐστίας, φιλοτιμίας, σοφῶν συνουσίας,
 φιλολόγων ἐπιμιξίας, ἄπαν δὲ τι ψυχὴν διαχέει καὶ αἴσθησιν. καὶ καθὼς
 ὑετῶν σφοδρῶν καταφερομένων καὶ ἀστροπῶν πυκνῶν ὑποφαινομένων
 κλονεῖται τὸ πᾶν καὶ ἡμαύρωται, οὔτω πένθει καὶ στεναγμοῖς κλονού-
 μενος ἔξηπόρημαι τὴν χθὲς ὠραιότητα δυσωπούμενος· τελετὰς ἀγίας,
 80 ἕορτάς, ὑμνωδίας, φωτοφανείας, Ἱερέων τάξεις, αὐτὸν οὐρανὸν μιμουμέ-
 νας καὶ τὰ οὐράνια.

4. 'Αλλ' οἶμαι τὸ κράτος ὀγανακτεῖν, ἐπεὶ καὶ εἰρηνικώ-
 τατον καὶ λίαν φιλάνθρωπον καὶ τῶν ἑορταῖομένων παραίτιον, ὡς ἐπὶ
 85 τοῖς φαιδροτέροις ἔατέον τὰ σκυθρωπότερα. καὶ γάρ ὑποχωροῦσιν ἡλίῳ
 σκιαὶ καὶ εὐεξίαις δραπετεύουσι νόσοι· τῷ καιρῷ τὰ οἰκεῖα νέμειν λυσι-
 τελέστερον, μηδὲ πειρᾶσθαι συνάγειν τὰ ἀντικείμενα — χωρὶς τὰ Μυσῶν

54 παραπληξίας corr. Us: παραπληπίας V || 56 μηδὲ corr. Us: μὴ
 δὲ V || 70 ὠφελε corr. Us: ὠφελε V || 76 δὲ τι mg. V || 86 μηδὲ
 corr. Us: μὴ δὲ V || Μυσῶν corr. Us: Μήδων V

²⁸ Hesiodus, *Op.* 358.

³¹ III Regn. 12:16 sqq.

²⁹ Ps. 104:18.

³² Gen. 3:1 sqq.

³⁰ Cf. Exod. 10:21 sqq.

³³ Ps. 21:16.

crows! What madness! What darkness! What cruelty in the doers, what pain and suffering for the victims! Worst of all, it was not a strife of foreigner against foreigner, of one tongue against another, but we were sons opposing and rebelling against fathers, brothers against brothers, fathers against sons! At this, to quote Hesiod, "my blood runs cold"; or, as the Psalmist says, "my heart passed through the iron," so that I wish no more to live and see the brightness of the sun: forasmuch as without disease we are ailing incurably, without frenzy we run mad, and without the darkness of the Egyptians we are yet worse benighted. And now of Israel were we become Judah and Ephraem, and both were divided in substance, and friends and neighbors became more implacable than implacable foes. And all this for the sake of temporary glory and a single crown, itself one too many and untimely, whereby everything was convulsed from top to bottom, whereby, in our day, he who by deceit and practice only just succeeded in deceiving the old Adam and turning him out of Eden, has without effort triumphed over the inhabited world! At this my discourse was interrupted more than that of a vertiginous man, and my tongue clave to the roof of my mouth, for I experienced and came to know those things which should never have been thought on nor come to pass; and as those hibernating animals, pent in their holes because of the cold, spend and express all their substance until the day of spring dawns, so I too — so to say — fed within upon myself. From that time I abandoned whatever seemed pleasant to me: companies, discussions, conversations, orations, imperial ceremonies, entertainments, displays, converse with the learned and companionship with literary men — all that charms the mind and senses. And just as, when the rains fall in torrents and the lightning flashes thick, all is shaken and grows dark, so by grief and mourning was I shaken and amazed, being troubled for the delights of yesterday — the holy rites, the festivals, the psalmody, the feasts of lights, the priestly orders, that imitate the heaven itself and heavenly things.

4. But I think His Majesty begins to be annoyed, since he is most peaceable and full of kindness and the author of the triumphs we celebrate: so that the more dismal topics must give place to the more cheerful. For shadows give way before the sun, and diseases fly before good states of health. It is better to allot its own to the time, and not to try to bring opposites together (the "terms of Mysians

fol. 44v

καὶ Φρυγῶν δρίσματα³⁴ — καὶ μοι δοκεῖ καὶ λίαν εἰκότως διαπελεύ-
εσθαι κάμε σύμφωνον ἔχειν καὶ τοῖς ἔξῆς προδυνμότατον. πλὴν ἀλλ' ὅτι
τῶν ἀηδεστέρων προδιαλαβόντων ἡδύτερα τὰ χαρίεντα· ἐπεὶ καὶ μετὰ
90 γείτονα χειμῶνα προθεινότερον ἔσπειρε, καὶ Ἰωσήφ ἡδίων μετὰ τὸν ἐλπισ-
θέντα ὄλεθρον,³⁵ καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἀπόπλουν, τὸ τοῦ μύθου, Τηλέμαχος,³⁶
καὶ Ἰδάκη μετὰ τὴν ὄλην,³⁷ καὶ μετὰ δίψαν πηγῆ, καὶ λιμήν | ἄκλυστος
μετὰ καταιγίδα καὶ χύματα. καὶ ὄλλως, ἵνα καλῶς τὸ κακὸν τεκμαιρό-
μενοι αὐτοῦ μὲν τῶν ἔργων καταγινώσκωμεν καὶ ὡς ἐνδακόντος ἔχεις
95 φυλασσώμεθα· φόβος γάρ βοήθημα αύτοσχέδιον, τοῖς δὲ καλοῖς ἴστά-
μεθα ἀσφαλέστερον· ὄλιεὺς γάρ πληγεὶς νοῦν φύει, κατὰ τὴν παροι-
μίαν.³⁸ διὸ μὴ κωλύων ἔτι τὰ χείλη πρόδρομος ἥκω τῆς εὐφημίας καὶ
τὸ παρὸν ἐπαινέσων, καὶ τὸ ὅππόν ἀναμνήσων, καὶ τὸ μέσον ἀπελέγξων,
καὶ τὸ ἐπιὸν ἀσφαλισόμενος.

100 5. Τὸ μὲν οὖν παρόν. δεῦρο μοι πᾶς δ τῶν θρόνων καὶ
δ τοῦ βήματος, οἱ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ὑψηγορίας καὶ διατάξεως, δσοι τε τοῦ
κράτους πέλας καὶ δσοι τούτων ἔχόμενοι, πολῖται καὶ ἀστυγείτονες, αἱ
πατριαὶ τῶν ἔθνῶν, οἱ ἀνὰ πάντα τὰ πέρατα, οἱ λογιζόμενοι τὴν
ἀνωθεν πρόνοιαν καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖθεν περιμένοντες κρίματα, οἱ θύοντες τὰς
105 αἰνέσεις καί, ὡς ἐν νότῳ χειμάρρους, τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν ἐπίστρεψον
ἐκκαλούμενοι,³⁹ καὶ ἔτι σὺν τούτοις οἱ ἐκτοπισθέντες τοῖς ἡμῶν ἀτοπή-
μασιν ἐν ἐσχατιαῖς ἀβάτοις τε καὶ ἀνύδροις, καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ
ἔξουσίας τὸν τῆς δουλείας κατακριθέντες λυγόν, οἱ πολλὰς μὲν ἀύπνους
νύκτας ἐγκαρτερήσαντες, κρυμούς τε καὶ ἡλίους ὑπενεγκόντες, μικροῦ καὶ
110 ἀποθανόντες ιδεῖν ἐφιέμενοι τὴν αἰθρίαν τῆς νῦν ἀναστάσεως! Δεῦτε
λευχειμοιοῦντες ἔνδοθεν ἔκτοθεν, ἀμφοτέρας τὰς λαμπάδας φαιδρύναν-
τες, τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰδάκαρα ἐναριθμούμενοι,⁴⁰ τῆς γερουσίας ἀπτόμενοι,⁴¹
Μωσέως ἡγουμένου καὶ Ἀαρὼν τῶν τιμίων, εἰς τὸν οἴκον Κυρίου μετὰ
δόμονίας συνίωμεν,⁴² εἰς τὰς πύλας αὐτοῦ ἐν ἔξομολογήσει, εἰς τὰς αὔλας
115 αὐτοῦ ἐν ὑμνοῖς.⁴³ διαβῶμεν τὸ κλίτος, τῇ σκηνῇ προσχωρήσωμεν, τῷ
ἱλαστηρίῳ προσχήσωμεν, ἀκούσωμεν, τί λαλήσει ὁ τοῖς Χερουσθίμ καλυπ-
τόμενος.⁴⁴ ίδού γάρ ἐρεῖ εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ,⁴⁵ καὶ “εἰρήνην
τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν ἀφίεμαι ὑμῖν.”⁴⁶ τί τῆς φωνῆς

88 καὶ om. Us qui legit ᔉχει καὶ et ᔉχον || 95 φυλασσώμεθα corr.
Us: -όμεθα V

³⁴ Karathanasis (supra, 18), 55, p. 43: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin (supra, 15), I, 465, no. 35.

³⁵ Gen. 46:29–30.

³⁶ Homerus, *Od.* 17.41–44.

³⁷ Homerus, *Od.* 13.250–51.

³⁸ Zenobius II.14; Gregorius Cypricus I.54; cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 35, 354; Diogenianus Epicur. I.61: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, II, 10.

³⁹ Ps. 125:4.

⁴³ Ps. 99:4.

⁴⁰ Exod. 6:23; 37:21; Num. 4:28.

⁴⁴ I Regn. 4:4; II Regn. 6:2; etc.

⁴¹ Exod. 12:21.

⁴⁵ Ps. 84:9.

⁴² Ps. 121:1.

⁴⁶ Joan. 14:27.

and Phrygians" lie apart); and I think it is very reasonable that I should be required to agree to this and to come with all eagerness to what follows. Not but what delights are more charming if unpleasantness has gone before: spring is more desirable after its neighbor winter, Joseph more beloved after his threatened death, and Telemachus in the story after his voyage, Ithaca after the salt sea, the water spring after thirst, and the still haven after tempest and waves: moreover, a just estimate of evil enables us to remark its works and to keep clear of it as from a viper that has bitten us (fear is a prompt ally), and to stand more safely in our time of blessings. The fisherman who was bitten found his wits, as the saying is. So I will no longer bridle my lips but come forward to be the herald of gladness and to praise the present, recall the past, convict what lies between, and make sure of the future.

5. First, for the present. Come unto me all ye who sit upon thrones or stand on the tribunal, and who thence derive your eloquence and your authority; all ye who are near to His Majesty and ye that follow after them; citizens and neighbors; the clans of the gentiles; all ye, far and wide, who regard the Divine Providence and await its judgments, ye who offer praises in sacrifice and, as a stream in the south, cry aloud "Return the captivity!"; ye who, by our offenses, were expelled from your seats into impenetrable and waterless fastnesses, and from freedom and power were condemned to the yoke of slavery; ye who endured many sleepless nights, bore chills and suns, and came near death in your longing to behold the dawn of this new resurrection! Come ye, clad inward and outward in white apparel, making bright both of your torches, ye numbered among those who are about Ithamar, members of the Council of Elders, with the noble Moses and Aaron at your head! Let us go in concord to the House of the Lord, to His gates in thanksgiving, to His halls with praise! Let us cross over the threshold, let us approach the tabernacle, let us attain the sanctuary! Let us hear what He that is hidden by the Cherubim will say! Lo, He will speak peace upon His people, and "my peace I give unto you, my peace I leave unto you."

fol. 45

τῆσδε μακαριώτερον, τί δὲ τοῦ φθέγματος ἀγιώτερον, τί τοῦ διδόντος
 120 καὶ τοῦ δωρήματος ὀλβιώτερον. ὃ τοῦ πολυταλάντου χαρίσματος, ὃ
 τῆς ὑπερμεγέθους εὐεργεσίας! δίδωσιν ὅδε καὶ ὅδε, πορίζουσι τύραννοι,
 οἱ ἐπὶ σκήπτροις παρέχουσι· ἄλλοι μὲν χαλκόν, ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ ἄφθονον
 ἄργυρον, λίθους, ἐσθῆτα, χρυσόν, διὰ γραμμάτων εὐκλείας, διὰ συμ-
 βόλων προνόμια. ὅσα τῆς ὕλης, ὅσα τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παρέχοντος· ἃ καὶ
 125 βλάπτει πολλάκις ἡ ὀνίνησι,⁴⁷ καὶ μετὰ στιγμὴν οὐκέτι ἔστιν, καὶ ὥσπερ
 αὔραι καὶ ὅναρ τοῖς νέμουσι [καὶ] τοῖς λαμβάνουσι συναποίχεται. οὗ δὲ
 Θεός ὁ διδοὺς καὶ Θεός θεῶν καὶ ἔστι τε καὶ πιστεύομεν, καὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ
 τὸ ἀκρότατον καὶ θειότατον, καὶ τυχὸν ἑαυτὸν κατὰ τό· αὐτός ἔστιν
 ἡ εἰρήνη,⁴⁸ καὶ ὁ Μεσίας αὐτός εἰμι ὁ λαλῶν σοι,⁴⁹ καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα,
 130 ἔκει κάνει ἐπινοήσης κτίσιν ἄλλην τῆς νῦν ὄρωμένης καὶ νοουμένης ἄμεινω
 καὶ φαιδροτέραν, οὗ τι τῆς εὐεργεσίας οὐ τι τῆς χάριτος ἐφάμιλλον
 εὑρήσεις καὶ ίσοστάσιον· ὅσῳ γάρ ὁ διδοὺς διενήνοχε τοῦ διδόντος,
 τοσούτῳ καὶ τὸ δώρημα τοῦ δωρήματος. ὃ μοι δοκεῖ καὶ ὁ ἐν πορφυρίδι
 φιλόσοφος, ἐπιστάμενος κρείσσον, ἐρεῖν, “μερὶς δλίγη μετ’ εἰρήνης ἡ οἰκος
 135 πολύχρυσος ἀνειρήνευτος.”⁵⁰ ἔτι δὲ καὶ σοφίας καὶ ζωῆς αὐτὴν ὑπερ-
 τίθησι· πρὸ γάρ εἰπών· ἡ καρδία σου τηρείτω σοφίαν ἐμήν,⁵¹ τὸ ἔπαθλον
 ὡς ὑπέρτιμον ἐπαγγέλεται· ἔτη γάρ ζωῆς. καὶ οὐκ ἔστη γε τούτῳ, ἄλλὰ
 τὸ κρείττον· καὶ πλῆθος εἰρήνης προστεθήσεται σοι.⁵² καὶ Ἰώβ τῶν
 πλεονεκτημάτων Θεοῦ ταύτην ὑπερθαυμάζει· θῆρας γάρ ἀγρίους εἰρην-
 140 εύειν ὑπισχνεῖται τῷ ἔκειθεν ἀμυνομένῳ,⁵³ εἴτε τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρη καὶ τοὺς
 βουνούς, οὐκ οἶδα, εἴτε τοὺς ἀστικούς καὶ τῆς ἔκειθεν ὠμότητος αἰνιττό-
 μενος. διὸ καὶ μᾶλλον προσεκτέον καὶ τηρητέον τὸ δώρημα, ίνα ὥσπερ
 δ τούτου δοτήρ, οὕτως ἀτίσιον ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ δώρημα διασώζοιτο· ἄλλὰ
 τὸ μὲν δώρημα καὶ ὁ διδοὺς οὕτω σεβάσμια.

145 6. Ἰνα δὲ τοῖς ὑπέρ ἔννοιαν δεξιούμενοι καὶ προσδοκίαν
 ἐν εὐκαιρίαις, ἐν θλίψει πλατυνόμενοι, μὴ διαμέλλωμεν, μηδὲ τὸν πάλαι
 Ἰσραὴλ ἐκμιμώμεθα ἡ σιωπῶντα τὰς χάριτας ἡ φθεγγόμενον, ἄλλὰ τῆς
 σιωπῆς χείρω — καὶ γάρ τοῖς ἄλλοις θαυμασίοις κωφεύοντες τῆς τρυφῆς
 νομένης διελοιδοροῦντο τῷ τρέφοντι⁵⁴ — αὐτοὶ τὰς φωνὰς μετὰ τῆς

126 [καὶ] suppl. Us || 127 πιστεύομεν VJk: πιστεύεται Us || 130 ἔκει
 VJk: ἐπει Us || 131 οὐ τι...οὐ τι VJk: οὔτε...οὔτε Us ||
 134 κρείσσον corr. Us: κρείσσων V || 136 τὸ VJk: τί Us || 137
 ἔστη VJk: ἔστι Us || 137 τούτῳ VJk: τοῦτο Us || 146 διαμελῶμεν
 V διατελῶμεν corr. Us || 147 ἄλλὰ V: ἄλλα corr. Us || 148 τῆς
 τρυφῆς VDu: τῆς τροφῆς Us

⁴⁷ Hesiodus, *Op.* 318.

⁵¹ Prov. 3:1–2.

⁴⁸ Eph. 2:14.

⁵² Ps. 71:7.

⁴⁹ Joan. 4:26.

⁵³ Job 5:22–23.

⁵⁰ Prov. 15:16.

⁵⁴ Cf. Exod. 16:1 sqq

What speech is more blessed than this, what word more holy, what more happy than the Giver and His gift? O for the grace of much value, for the immense benefit! This or that man may give, tyrants provide, kings supply, some bronze, others abundance of silver, gems, clothing, nobilities conferred by diploma, and privileges by insignia: these gifts may harm or profit, and in a moment they are no more, and like airs or dreams they pass away with those who give <and> receive them. But where the Giver is God (and God of Gods He is and we believe Him to be), and gives us the most excellent and divine of His gifts, perhaps even Himself, according to the saying "He is peace," and "I am Messiah Himself that speaketh unto thee," and so on, there, even if you should devise another creation better and brighter than the one we now see and know, yet you shall not find anything to rival or equal this benefit or grace. For as Giver differs from giver, so does gift from gift. In knowledge of this I think the philosopher in the purple said "better a small portion with peace than a house full of gold where peace is not"; and he prizes it even above wisdom and life: for having premised "let thy heart keep my wisdom," he promises the reward beyond price: it is "years of life"; but he did not stop there: best of all is that "abundance of peace shall be added unto you." And Job places this above the other gifts of God, for he promises that savage beasts shall be at peace with him whom God defends — whether he means those on the mountains and hills, I know not, or whether he hints at town-dwelling beasts for their cruelty. Wherefore we must be the more careful to preserve the gift, so that, like its Giver, it may remain among us eternally. So much for the worshipful nature of gifts and Giver.

6. But now that we are graced with prosperity beyond thought or expectation and enlarged from our distresses, let us not be unmindful nor imitate Israel of old who was silent over his blessings or else uttered what was worse than silence: for they were dumb regarding the other miracles, and when their food was rained from heaven they abused their Nourisher. But let us raise our voices and our hearts,

150 γνώμης ὑψώσωμεν, καὶ μετ' εὐνοίας ἀμφότερα· καὶ τίς λαλήσει τὰς δυναστείας τοῦ Κυρίου βιόσωμεν, τίς δὲ τὰς αἰνέσεις αὐτοῦ ἀκουστὰς τοῖς πέρασι καταστήσεται;⁵⁵ ὅτι συνέτριψε ρόμφαιάν καὶ πόλεμον καὶ τὰ θεῖα τρυφᾶν ἡμῖν ἔχαρισατο, ὅτι ἐπλεόνασεν ἡμῖν τὴν αὐτοῦ μεγαλωσύνην καὶ ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐλαποποίησε καὶ ἐκ τῶν τῆς ἀπογνώσεως
fol. 45v 155 βυθὸν ἐπανήγαγε.⁵⁶ τίς εἰδὼς, ὅποι τὰ ἡμέτερα ὢπει καὶ ὅπῃ τὰ ἐκείνου ἀνθέλκει, συλλογίσοιτο τὴν ἐν μέσῳ χρηστότητα, ὅτι τὰ παροργισμοῦ αἴτια παραβλέψας, ἐν δὲ τοῖς οἰκτιρμοῖς αὐτοῦ διαβλέψας, τὸν φραγμὸν εἶλε καὶ διέλυσε τὸ μεσότοιχον.⁵⁷

7. Ὡ τῆς ἐπινοίας! Τὸ γῆς καὶ θαλάττης μεθόριον, τὸ
160 μεταίχμιον ἡπειρώτου τε καὶ νητίου στρατοῦ, καὶ βασιλεῖς διχογνωμονοῦντας διστάλοντας, οἷον τὸν Φρυγίας τε καὶ Μυκήνης ἀκούομεν,⁵⁸ εἰς δύμοφροσύνην, εἰς δύμόνοιαν συνεπήγαγε. τίς τὸ πέλαγος τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ περιλήψεται; τίς δὲ τὸν τῆς φιλανθρωπίας αὐτοῦ βυθὸν καταλήψεται; ὅτι τὰ διαρράγεντα μέρη τῆς οἰκουμένης συνούλωσε, καὶ
165 οὕτως εἰς ὄλοκληρίαν καὶ συμφυίαν [συνέστησεν], ἵνα μηκέτι Σκύθης καὶ βάρβαρος, καὶ τὸ καὶ τὸ καλούμεθα,⁵⁹ χριστιανοὶ δὲ πάντες καὶ Θεού τέκνα καὶ ὡδίνες τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ λεγώμεθα καὶ δεικνύμεθα; τίς τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς σοφίας καὶ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ διηγήσεται; ὅτι τοὺς
170 ἐσπερίους λύκους καὶ τῶν ἔφων περιεργοτέρους καὶ θρασυτέρους τοσαύτη μετεστοιχείωσεν ἰλαρότητι, ὡς καὶ πιστεύεσθαι φυλάσσειν τὸ ποίμνιον καὶ τοὺς μονίους ἐπιτιθεμένους καὶ ἀπελαύνειν καὶ ἀποτρέπεσθαι. ὅτι τὸν τῶν ζιζανίων σπορέα καὶ φύλακα, τὸν νέον Ἀδερ,⁶⁰ τὸν καινὸν Ὁλοφέρνην⁶¹ προδιαμεθοδευσάμενος τῷ αὐτοῦ κόρῳ τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ⁶² ἀνεσφόσατο. καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰς οἰκείας πηγὰς καὶ συκᾶς
175 ἕκαστος τὸ θέρος ἀμῶν,⁶³ καὶ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα τρυγῶν καὶ ἀνακαθαίρων τὴν ἄλω, καὶ βαθύνων τὸ ὑπολήνιον, τῷ βραβευτῇ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπεύχεται. τίς τὴν ἀνεξερεύνητον αὐτοῦ κηδεμονίαν ὑμνήσεται; ὅτι μετὰ Σολομῶντα τὸ<ν> εἰρηνικὸν καὶ φιλόσοφον τῷ Ἱεροβοάμ τοῦ ποιμνίου διασπασθέντος διὰ τὴν τῶν νεωτέρων βουλήν,⁶⁴ τὸν ζηλωτὴν Ἰωνᾶν

153 τὴν om. Us || 161 Φρυγίας V: Φθίας Us || 165 [συνέστησεν] post συμφυίαν fortasse || 167 λεγώμεθα: λεγόμεθα coni. Jk || 172–73 τὸν νέον Ἀδερ, τὸν καινὸν Ὁλοφέρνην: Συμεὼν ὁ Σκύθης. Πέτρῳ τῷ σὶδη Συμεὼν mg. V || 173 κόρῳ corr. Us: κύρῳ V || 178 τὸν corr. Ku: τὸ VUs || 178–79 Λέοντα βασιλέα Κωνσταντίνον τὸν σὺδὸν αὐτοῦ mg. V

⁵⁵ Ps. 105:2.

⁵⁶ Ps. 70:21.

⁵⁷ Eph. 2:14.

⁵⁸ Cf. *similia*: Leutsch-Schneidewin (*supra*, 15), I, 465 et notam 35.

⁵⁹ Cf. Col. 3:11.

⁶¹ Judith 2:4, etc.

⁶⁰ Cf. III Regn. 11:17.

⁶² Cf. Ps. 146:2; Is. 49:6.

⁶³ Cf. Prov. 4:21, 5:16, 18; Is. 36:16; IV Regn. 18:31.

⁶⁴ III Regn. 12:1–24.

both in loyal worship, and let us cry "who shall speak of the powers of the Lord, who shall make His praises heard to the ends of the earth, Who has broken the sword and battle and granted us the enjoyment of heavenly blessings, Who has multiplied his greatness upon us and hath turned and made us to live, and led us up from the gulf of despair?" Who that knows whither our state was declining and how His arm drew us back, would conceive His goodness to us meanwhile, Who has overlooked the causes of His anger and regarded us in His mercy, and dissolved the barrier and pulled down the middle wall?

7. Behold His design! The meeting point of land and sea, the battleground of land and naval forces; kings quarreling and divided as once, we hear, did those of Phrygia and Mycenae, He has reconciled in harmony and concord. Who will contain the ocean of His goodness? Who will reach the depth of His mercy, Who has healed the parts of the world that were split apart and thus brought them together in wholeness and continuity, where we are no longer called 'Scythian' or 'barbarian' or I know not what, but may be named and shown to be Christians and sons of God and travail of the Spirit? Who shall recount the riches of His wisdom and power, Who has transformed the wolves of the West, more persistent and bold than those of the East, into such cheerfulness as convinces us that He guards His flock and repels and drives away the savage brutes that molest it; Who has caused the sower and nourisher of tares, the new Hadad, the modern Holofernes, to give place to his son, and thus has redeemed the dispersion of Israel, and once more every man by his own well and his own fig tree reaps his crop and harvests his vineyard and winnows his threshing floor and deepens his vat, and offers up his prayer to the Giver of these blessings? Who shall recall His unsearchable care for us, Who, when after the peaceable and wise Solomon the flock was divided by Jeroboam through the counsel of the younger men, granted to our times the zealot Jonah, and maintained

fol. 46

180 τοῖς καιροῖς ἔχαρισατο,⁶⁵ τηρήσας ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις τὸν μέγιστον, καὶ χειρὶ χεῖρα κρατύνων, καὶ βραχίονι βραχίονα δυναμῶν, καὶ κινῶν καὶ μετακινῶν ὅπου βούλεται καὶ ὡς βούλεται, τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ βασιλέα καὶ πρόμαχον καὶ ἀγωνιστὴν καὶ διαλλακτήριον τὸ δέον σκοπούμενον, τὸ συμφέρον προμηθούμενον τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀνεστήσατο. τίς ταῦτα τῶν
 185 εἰδότων ὅσον ἡ εἰρήνη καλόν, η̄ θέμις ἐστίν, ἐπαινέσεται;⁶⁶ τίς τὰ παρόντα κατ’ ἀξίαν αἰνέσεται; | τὴν παρ’ ἐλπίδα μεταβολήν, τὴν παρὰ προσδοκίαν ἀλλοίωσιν, τὴν ἀνέκφραστον ἀμειψιν, τὴν ἀπιστον ταύτην ἐνότητα; πόσων ἴστορίαι Πολυβίων, πόσων Πλουτάρχων παράλληλοι, ποίων ῥαψῳδῶν μέτρα, τινῶν εὐγλωττίαι βρητόρων τὰ τοιαῦτα σχήσουσι διηγήματα; οὐδὲ τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἔγραμαι, τὸ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου,⁶⁷
 190 τῶν τοιούτων χωρῆσαι τὸ μέγεθος.

8. ’Αλλ’ ἐπεὶ τῆς εὐφημίας οὐδ’ ἐφαπτόμεθα — καὶ γάρ ὁρώμεθα καὶ αὐτῶν Λακώνων βραχυλογώτεροι — καλῶς ἀν ἡδη τοῖς ἔξῆς εύδρομήσωμεν. ὅτι μὲν οὖν τὸ δῶρον τῆς δεξιᾶς τοῦ ὑψίστου καὶ
 195 ὁ λημῶν ἀν ἐπίδοιτο· τίνος γάρ καὶ διθεν; εἰ γάρ οὐδὲ τῶν μικρῶν τι δίχα τῆς ἀνωθεν τελεῖται προνοίας,⁶⁸ ὅσον ἡ παγκόσμιος σωτηρία καὶ ἀγαλλίασις! ἀλλ’ ὅτι μὲν ἐκεῖθεν, οὐκ ἀδηλον. νῦν δ’ ὅ τι πέρ ἐστιν τὴν φύσιν διασκεψώμεθα, ἵνα τὸ λυσιτελές ὅσον καὶ οἷον συνέντες παγιώτεροι μένωμεν. ἔστι τοιγαροῦν εἰρήνη, ὡς ἔγωγε διορίζομαι, στάσεως προδια-
 200 λαβούσης συνάφεια, ἡ περιχαρής διμιλία μετὰ σιωπήν ἔγκοτον, φιλο-
 νεικίας καταστροφή, ὅπλων ἀπόθεσις, ἔχθρας κατόλυσις, συναίρεσις ἐκ διαιρέσεως, ἐκ διχονίας διμόνοια, μετὰ διαφωνίαν διμοφωνία, καὶ ὅπως
 ἀν οἱ τῶν τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος ἀπαντλήσαντες καὶ τὸν Σταγειρίτην κατα-
 πιόντες γένει καὶ διαφοραῖς ὑπογράψαιεν. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἡ ὅ τι σχεδόν
 205 νῦν δέ μοι σκόπει τὸ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν αὔτῆς εὔχρηστον, σειράν ἐξ οὐρανόθεν⁶⁹
 ὑπολαβών διὰ πάντων καθήκουσαν, τῆς δ’ ἐξαπτομένης τὰς αὔτῆς
 συντρόφους καὶ μύστιδας· φιλίαν, ἀγάπην, διμοφροσύνην, διμόνοιαν, ὅσα
 τῆς μακαρίας ἔταιρείας καὶ συγγενείας, δῶν ὑποστῆναι τι δίχα τῶν
 ἀμηχάνων, κάν τοπονοίᾳ συστῆ, τοῦ μὴ συστάντος δεινότερον††. καὶ
 210 πρῶτα μέν, ἵνα τῶν θείων ἐς τὴν παροῦσαν ἀποχωρῶμεν — εἰρήνη γάρ,
 οὐ θεολογία, τὸ παριστάμενον. αὐτίκα τῶν ἀγγέλων ἡ τάξις τῆς

180–81 τὸν μέγιστον... βραχίονι: ‘Ρωμανόν adscr. V || 185 η̄ corr.
 Ku: η̄ VUs || 187 ἀνέκφραστον corr. Us: ἀνεκφραστόν V ||
 190 καὶ om. Us || 195 λημῶν corr. Ku: λειμῶν V λυμεών Us ||
 204 ὅ τι: ὅτι Us || 205 ἐπὶ πᾶσιν: τοῖς πᾶσιν Us || 206 τῆς
 VKu: τὰς Us || 209 post δεινότερον corrupt. suppl. Jk

⁶⁵ Ion. 2:11–3:3.

⁶⁶ Hesiodus, *Op.* 137.

⁶⁷ Joan. 21:25.

⁶⁸ Cf. Matt. 10:29–31.

⁶⁹ Homerus, *Il.* 8.19.

him greatest among the greatest, and strengthened his hand with His own, and gave to his arm the power of His own arm, and guided him hither and thither where and as He wished, and raised him up to be, in one and the same person, our Emperor and bulwark and champion and peacemaker, mindful of our needs and devising what was profitable for our affairs? Who of those that know how fair a thing is peace will praise these things as they should be praised? Who will worthily extol our present blessings, the unhoped-for transformation, the unexpected change, the inexpressible alteration, this unbelievable union? How many Histories of Polybius, or Lives of Plutarch, what verses of rhapsodes or gems of rhetoricians, will be needed to contain such stories as these? I too imagine, with the Beloved Disciple, that "the whole world could not contain the greatness of them."

8. But since we are not yet so much as touching on the exordium (we seem to be more laconic than the Laconians themselves), we should now properly proceed directly to what follows. That the gift comes from the hand of the Most High, even the blear-eyed can see. For from whom or where else could it come? If it be true that not even small things are performed without the Divine Providence, then how great must be universal salvation and rejoicing! That thence it comes is, then, undoubted; but let us now consider what its nature may be, so that, understanding the greatness and quality of our advantage, we may be more firmly convinced of it. Peace, then, as I define it, is the composition of previous strife, the joyful converse after sullen silence, the destruction of contentiousness, the laying aside of arms, the dissolution of enmity, union out of division, harmony out of dispute, concord after discord, or however those learned in the works of the son of Ariston, or nurtured on the Stagirite, might qualify it by genus and differentia. Such then, or nearly such, is its nature. But now let us look at its universal benefits, picturing a chain from heaven passing down through everything, and the companions and initiates of peace fastened to it — friendship, love, concord, harmony, all that belong to that blessed companionship and fraternity, of which it is impossible that any one member should exist without the rest, even though in fancy one were to create for it an existence more monstrous than non-existence! And first, to come from things divine to the present matter (for peace, not theology, is now our concern), the angelic order, defending the unity of its first

πρώτης καὶ ἀνεκφράστου πηγῆς τὸ ἐν ἀμυνόμενοι καὶ διψῶντες ἀεὶ τῆς
δρέξεως πρός τε τὴν τῶν τοιούτων αἰτίαν καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἀστασίαστοι
μένουσιν, οὐχ ἥττον διὰ τὴν ούσιαν, ἡς ἡξιώθησαν, ἢ τὴν τῆς εἰρήνης
215 φωτοχυσίαν, ἡς ἀπολαύουσι, τὸν μέντοι τῆς χάριτος ἀλογήσαντα ἵσμεν
τὴν δίκην ἀξίαν ἐκτίσαντα, ἐξ ἀστραπῆς μὲν εἰς σκοτίαν μεταβαλόντα,⁷⁰
ίνα κεῖται τυχὸν τοῖς δόμοίσις ὑπόδειγμα· τί δai ὁ περὶ τὸν αἰθέρα
διάκοσμος; ἀρ' οὐκ ἀεὶ διασώλει τὸ ἀστασίαστον; ὅτι γάρ ἀμιγῆ τὰ
τοιαῦτα διαφορᾶς καὶ πέμπτον σῶμα τὸ στερέωμα λέγουσι, ξένον αὐτὸ
fol. 46v 220 πάστης | συνθέσεως⁷¹ ἀποφαίνοντες· στάσις δὲ συνθέσεως ἔργον ὅν, εἴκει δὲ
νυξὶ μὲν ἥλιος, νύκτες δὲ ὄρθροις, οἱ δὲ τὸν ἑωσφόρον προαγορεύουσιν,
ὅ δὲ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐπάγεται, τῇ δ' ὑποχωροῦσιν ἀστέρες. καὶ τῇ τοιαύτῃ
φιλίᾳ ἀίδιον αὐτοῖς τὸ εἶναί τε καὶ τὸ φέρεσθαι ὠραῖον, καὶ καιροὶ καὶ
χρόνοι τὸ μέσον ἑαυτῶν κατὰ μικρὸν τιθασσεύοντες, εἴτα τοῖς ἄκροις
225 οἵον δακτύλοις δόμοιειδέσιν, δμοφύεσιν ἀλλήλων ἔχόμενοι, χορείαν χορεύουσι
καὶ χορείαν χορῶν πάντων εύρυθμοτέραν καὶ πλατυτέραν, καὶ ίνα τὰ
προφανέστερα λέγωμεν, ἀρα οὐχὶ ἵππων ἀγέλαι καὶ ἐταιρεῖαι βοῶν
ἐτερογενῆ καίτοι περ ὄντα ἀναμίξ διαιτώμενα φαίνεται; καὶ οὐ τάδε
μὲν διαφέρεται, τάδε δὲ ἀντιφέρεται, οὐδὲ δρίζουσί τε καὶ παρορίζουσιν,
230 ἀλλὰ τὴν πόσιν ἐρέπτεται ἀδιάκριτα; ποίμνια δὲ καὶ αἰπόλια τοῖς αὐτοῖς
στηκοῖς δμοθυμαδὸν εἰσοικίζεται, εἴτα τοῖς τῶν ποιμένων καὶ νεύμασι καὶ
συρίγμασιν εὔείκτως ἔγεται, φέρεται, διακρίνεται. κέντρα δὲ φέρουσι
μέλισσαι — καὶ καθορᾶται γάρ — ἀλλ' οὐ τοῖς δμοφύλοις, οὐμενοῦν, καὶ
γάρ εἰσὶ φιλάλληλαι καὶ πιστόταται. φαλαγγίοις δὲ τοῖς ἀλλογενέσι
235 καὶ ἀλλοκότοις κηφῆσι καὶ κοθιούροις, εἴπειν, καὶ τοῦτο φοβοῦσαι καὶ
μόνον καὶ εἰς φυγὴν τῶν σίμβλων ἐκτρέπουσαι. τὸ φαυλότατον μύρμη-
κες μιᾷ ταμιεύοντες ἐν ὁπῆ δμοῦ μὲν διαπονοῦσιν, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ
συνάγουσι καὶ δμως οὐκ ἐρίζουσιν, οὐκ ἀμύνουσι, κοινὰ δὲ τὰ ἔφόδια
θησαυρίζουσιν.

240 9. Οὕτω διὰ πάντων, δσον διὰ βραχέων ἐρεῖν, ὁ τῆς
εἰρήνης δεσμός τε καὶ πλοῦτος καὶ ἔστι καὶ διαφαίνεται. ἀνθρωπος δὲ
τὸ θειότατον ἔργον καὶ πρώτιστον, δι' ὃν τὰ βλεπόμενα καὶ νοούμενα,
τὸ τῆς αὐτῆς χειρὸς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡξιωμένον ἐμπινεύσεως, τὸ γνώσει
καὶ λόγῳ τετιμημένον καὶ τὰ θεῖα φρονεῖν παιδεύμενον, ὁ σύνθετος
245 ἄγγελος, ὁ χαρακτήρ τοῦ ποιήσαντος, ὁ βουλήσει δεδημιουργημένος
καὶ θαλάσσης ἀρχῶν καὶ κυριεύων ἡπείρου, δέον θηρσί τε καὶ κτήνεσι
τὸν χόλον ἐπάγειν ἢ κατὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ δυσμενοῦς μόνον, ὁ δὲ τῷ ἀδελφῷ

232 εὔείκτως corr. Jk: εὔίκτως VUs εὐηκόως Ku || 233 καθορᾶται
V: καθορᾶτε corr. Us || 240 διαβραχέων V

⁷⁰ Luc. 10:18.

⁷¹ Aristoteles, *De caelo* I.2–3.

and inexpressible source, and thirsting ever in longing, stays in harmony both with the Cause of these things and with itself, not less through the substance with which it is blessed than through the splendor of the peace which it enjoys: whereas we know that the angel who despised that grace paid a condign penalty and exchanged the brilliance of lightning for darkness, where he lies as a warning no doubt to those who are like him. What is the ethereal order? Does it not always preserve harmony? Because this order is unmixed with discord, they call the firmament a "fifth body" and declare that it is strange to any kind of synthesis. Strife is the work of synthesis. The sun yields to night, night to dawn, that some call Lucifer, and he leads on the day, to which the stars give place. So in this friendship is their being eternal and their motion beautiful, and times and seasons, taming by degrees what is between themselves, at last join one another with fingertips that are of one shape and one nature, and dance together in a dance that is more rhythmic and far-flung than all dances. Or, to take more obvious examples, do not the flocks of horses and herds of oxen, though different in kind, pasture indiscriminately together? There is no dispute or antipathy between them, they do not issue orders and counter orders but crop the grass without distinction. Flocks of sheep and goats dwell harmoniously in the same folds, and then obediently go, or are led, or divide, at the gestures or whistles of the shepherds. Bees, as we see, carry stings, yet by no means for use against their fellows, for they love one another and are most faithful, but against the foreign and miscreant idlers and drones, it is said, and this merely to frighten them and turn them out of the honeycombs. On the humblest level, the ants, keeping house in a single crevice, work together and unite in the same tasks; yet they do not quarrel or fight but treasure up their means of livelihood in common.

9. So through all creation — to speak it briefly — the bond and wealth of peace prevail and appear. But man, the most divine and first of works, for whom the worlds of sense and thought exist, held worthy of the same hand and the same inspiration, ennobled by knowledge and reason and educated in Divine Truth, the composite angel, the image of his Maker, endowed with will, lord of the sea and master of the land, when he should discharge his wrath on beasts and brutes or on the common foe alone, yet whets his sword against his brother and forges his arms and dons

fol. 47

Θήγει τὸ ξίφος, καὶ ὅπλα χαλκεύει, καὶ θώρακα περιβάλλεται, καὶ γέρρα
 τινάσσει, καὶ καταπέλτας ὁξύνει, καὶ εἰκονίζει τὸν Ἀρην, καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸν
 250 Ἀπόλλω πηδᾷ, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἀραβικούς ὁρᾶς θῆρας,⁷² καὶ ὀρνιθῶν τῶν
 ἐν τοῖς νέφεσιν ὑπεραίρεται. ἀλλὰ τούτοις ἀφόρατον τὸ κακόν, καὶ διὰ
 τοῦτο εὐφυλακτότερον. ὁ δὲ καὶ δόλους ῥάπτει καὶ πικρίας ἔσωθεν
 γέμει καὶ φιλεῖν ὑποκρίνεται καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ κρύπτει πόνον
 καὶ τοῖς χείλεσι σωτηρίαν προβάλλεται, ὑποφενακίζει καὶ τοῖς νεύμασι
 255 καὶ τοῖς σχήμασιν, ἔχεμυθεῖ, ἀλλοφάσσει. τί γάρ οὐχὶ τελεῖ; τί δαΐ οὐ
 σκέπτεται τῶν ἔχομένων ἀπωλείας καὶ φόνου; καὶ ταῦτα ίνα τί; ίν'
 ἐγκολπώσηται ταῦτα καὶ ἀέαυτὸν αὐτίκα συναπολέσεται, ίνα κλέος
 ἔξοι τὸ καὶ χλόης εὔμαραντότερον. ίν' ἐπὶ γῆς γραφῇ καὶ τοῦτο τυχὸν
 260 κατὰ τὸν Κάιν καὶ Λάμεχ καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην φατρίαν,⁷³ ἀπαλειφῇ δὲ τῆς
 βίβλου τῶν σωζομένων,⁷⁴ τοῖς ἐρίφοις ἀποπεμπόμενος,⁷⁵ ίν' ἔχης ἀγαθὰ
 κείμενα εἴπῃ καὶ ἀκούσῃ τὸ ἄφρων, τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπαιτούμενος,⁷⁶ ίνα πάθη
 τὰ Κροίσου καὶ Πολυκράτους, καὶ ἀρχόμενος καὶ οἰχόμενος.⁷⁷ ἀλλὰ τάδε
 μὲν Ἐλλήνων παῖδες ποιούντων τε καὶ πασχόντων, ἐπεὶ καὶ θεῶν τὸν
 265 οὐρανὸν ἐπλήσαν — ὡς τῆς αὐτονομίας! ὡς μὲν φιλοπολέμων, ὡς δὲ
 μαχίμων, ἐριστικῶν, ἐπιβούλων, μᾶλλον ἀναπνεόντων τὸν Ἀρην ἢ τῆς
 κνίστης ὀσφραινομένων ἐλισσομένης περὶ καπνῷ.⁷⁸ ὃν δὲ τὰ πρωτότυπα
 στάσεις καὶ μάχαι, πότε ἀν εἰρηνεύσειε τὰ μιμήματα; ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν αὐτοῖς
 θεοῖς καὶ οὐδενὸς ἔλαυνοντος ἀπελήλαται καὶ ἀπήλειπται· τὸ γάρ κακὸν
 ἀνύπαρκτον, ἀνυπόστατον.

270

10. Ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ τοῦ καινοῦ νόμου καὶ τῆς καινοτέρας
 ἐντολῆς μαθηταί,⁷⁹ οἱ τοῦ εἰρηνικοῦ καὶ πράου καὶ ταπεινόφρονος
 μύσται,⁸⁰ οἱ τῶν ἐπηρεαλόντων καὶ δυσμενῶν καὶ θλιβόντων καὶ τυραν-
 νούντων ὑπερεύχεσθαι διδασκόμενοι καὶ τοῖς φίλοις τὴν ψυχὴν τιθέναι⁸¹
 275 καὶ εἴκειν τοῖς ἀγγαρεύουσι,⁸² καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον, οἱ εἰδότες ὅτι ἔστιν δὲ
 τοὺς σοφοὺς σοφιζόμενος⁸³ καὶ δρασσόμενος ἐντέχνους, καὶ δρῶν ἐν

250 ὁρᾶς corruptum susp. Jk an ὁρ[ωρ]α Du || 251 ἀφόρατον V:
 εὐφύρατον corr. Us || 255 ἀλλοφάσει V: ἀλλοφάσσει Us || 257
 ταῦτα: ταῦτ' ἀ corr. Ku || ἔαυτὸν: καὶ ἀ ἔαυτὸν Jk || συναπ-
 ολέσεται Ku: συναπολήσεται Us || 259 φατρίαν V: φατριάν Us ||
 260 ἔχης: ἔχη Us ἔχω Ku || 261 ἄφρων Us || 264 ἐπλήρουν Us ||
 272–73 καὶ τυραννούντων om. Us || 274 ἀγγαρεύουσι corr. Us:
 ἀγορεύουσι V

⁷² Aristoteles, *Mirabilia* 845a 24.⁷⁸ Homerus, *Il.* 1.317.⁷³ Gen. 4:15.⁷⁹ Joan. 13:34.⁷⁴ Ps. 68:29.⁸⁰ Cf. Matt. 11:29.⁷⁵ Matt. 25:33.⁸¹ Matt. 5:44; Joan. 15:13.⁷⁶ Luc. 12:20.⁸² Matt. 5:41.⁷⁷ Herodotus I.85; III.53.⁸³ I Cor. 3:19.

his corselet and brandishes his shield and makes sharp his missiles and images Ares and outleaps Apollo and glares like the Arabian beasts and soars above the birds that are in the clouds. But by these antics his evil is detectable and therefore more easily guarded against. But he also concocts plots and is full of bitterness within and pretends friendship and hides his grief beneath his tongue and professes salvation with his lips, deceives by nods and gestures, holds his peace or speaks in falsehood. What does he not perform or devise to compass destruction and murder? And why does he do all this? In order to pocket the very things that will make for his own destruction; in order to get glory that withers sooner than grass; in order that he may be marked on earth, perhaps with the brand of Cain and Lamech and their crew, that he may be expunged from the Book of Salvation and be dismissed among the goats; in order that he may have riches, boast of his treasures, and listen to folly when his soul is required of him; and may, first and last, suffer the fate of Croesus and Polycrates! But these were the crimes and sufferings of the sons of the pagans, because in their presumption they filled heaven with gods who were war lovers, warriors, quarrelsome, treacherous, for ever breathing Ares or snuffing up the fat that turned about in the smoke. When the models were strife and war, how should their imitations be at peace? But these people, together with their gods, have been driven away, though there was none to drive, and abolished. For the evil was without being and substance.

10. But we, the disciples of the new law and the new commandment, the initiates of the peaceable, the meek, the lowly: we who are taught to pray for those who injure us, hate us, grieve us, and tyrannize over us, and to lay down our life for our friends, and to submit to those who lay burdens upon us, we — what is more — who know that there is One who instructs the wise and lays hold upon

κρυπτῷ,⁸⁴ καὶ ἀποδιδοὺς ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ,⁸⁵ τοὺς πολέμους καὶ τὸ τε καθ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἀναλόγως ἀσπασόμεθα; μηκέτι, μηδαμῶς, ἀδελφοί, ὅλλ' εἰ καὶ πισῶς ἐκείνοις συναπηνέχθημεν — τῆς γὰρ αὐτῆς πλάσεως, εἰ καὶ μὴ πλάνης, μετέχομεν — ὅλλ' οὖν ἐπαναχθέντες μηκέτι 280 παρενεχθείμεν. ἔστι καὶ πεσόντας ἔξανασθηναι καὶ στῆναι τῶν οὐ πεσόντων ἀσφαλέστερον καὶ ἀνώτερον.

fol. 47v

11. Ἐπεὶ τὰ τοῦ ἐπανακτέον τελούμενα καὶ προδεικτέον τὰ τῆς ἑορτῆς ἐκδηλότερον· ἀπαν γὰρ ἄδηλον ἀηδέστερον. ἔπει δὲ τὸ πᾶν οὐχ οἶόν τε διατρανῶσαι μὴ καὶ | τὰ πρότερον παραδεῖξαντας, τὰ δ' οὐκ ἄλλως μὴ καὶ τὰς λαβήσ καὶ τὰ αἰτια παραστήσαντας, καὶ διῃν καὶ ὅπως ἐκεῖνά τε προέβη καὶ τάδ' ἐπέβη, οὗτω μοι δοκεῖ διαθετέον εἶναι τὸν λόγον. ἦνθει τὰ ἡμέτερα πάλαι καὶ ἀνθοῦντα προέκοπτεν, ὥνγαλε, τῆς ἀκμῆς ἐθαυμάζετο, τῆς ἐπιδόσεως ἐθειάζετο, ζηλωτὰ πᾶσιν ὑπῆν καὶ ὀρώμενα καὶ λεγόμενα καὶ μετὰ δόξης διηχείτο 290 τοῖς πέρασιν, ὅτε τὸ στρατιωτικὸν ἐρρυθμίζετο Λέοντι καὶ συνεβούλευεν Ἀχιτόφελ⁸⁶ καὶ Δράκων καὶ Σόλων ἐθέσπιζον, ὅταν αἱ μυθικαὶ μοῦσαι, οἷον εἰπεῖν, ἐπὶ γῆς ἐγνωρίζοντο καὶ ὁ Ἀρης κατετιτρώσκετο,⁸⁷ ὅταν εἰς πέταυρον Ἄιδου τὸ ἀφιλόσοφον, καὶ παρὰ τὸ δρυὸς σκότος ἀνομία, κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν,⁸⁸ καὶ αἱ Βριάρεω χεῖρες ἐλωστρακίζοντο,⁸⁹ ὅτε τὸ 295 χρυσοῦν γένος ἐπολιτεύετο⁹⁰ καὶ τὸ πᾶν εἶχεν εύδαιμονία καὶ τῶν θείων ἀπόλαυσις. οὗτω πως εἶχε τὰ ἡμέτερα πάλαι, συνήνθει καὶ τὰ Βουλγάρων καὶ ἔσφριγε. καὶ πῶς γὰρ οὔ, υἱοθετηθέντων αὐτῶν καὶ θεῷ ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπομαθόντων μὲν ἥδη τὰ τῶν ἀμαξοβίων τε καὶ νομάδων, μεταμαθόντων δὲ τὸ τῆς χάριτος εὐαγγέλιον· ἔως μὲν ἵσορρόπτα τὰ 300 ζυγά καὶ ὁ θεῖος εὐμενής ὁφθαλμός, γαλήνη τὴν θάλασσαν εἶχε καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος ἐξ οὐρίας ἐφέρετο.

12. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ κύβος ἀντέστραπται καὶ ὑπερέσχε τὰ τάλαντα, ἔδει τε γενέσθαι κακῶς καὶ νικῆσαι τὰ χείρονα, εἴτε τοῦ καλοῦ τὴν ἀκρώρειαν φθάσαντος καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ κάταντες ἀποβλέποντος, εἴτε τῶν παραπτωμάτων ἡμῶν θεῷ παρεστώτων καὶ τὸ κόνδυ τῆς μέθης προκαλουμένων, ἵνα τοῖς δεινοῖς κραιπαλήσωμεν, φεῦ μοι τοῦ

277 ἀναλόγως Us: ἀνευλόγως V || 279 ἐπαναχθέντες VKu: ἐπαναχθέντας Us || 290 ἐρρυθμίζετο corr. Us: ἐρυθμίζετο V || 298 ἀμαξοβίων corr. Us: ἀμαζονίων V || 302 ὁ κύβος corr. Us: τὸ κύβος V || Συμεών mg. V

⁸⁴ Matt. 6:4.⁸⁶ II Regn. 15:12–31.⁸⁵ Matt. 23:3; Rom. 2:6.⁸⁷ Homerus, Il. 5.855–63.⁸⁸ Zenobius VI.12: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin (*supra*, 15), I, 165.⁸⁹ Cf. Theoph. Cont. (Bonn. ed.), 258, 15; Zenobius V.48: cf. Leutsch-Schneide-win, I, 140.⁹⁰ Hesiodus, Op. 109.

the cunning and sees in secret and rewards every man according to his works — shall we, in defiance of reason, embrace wars and our own destruction? No longer, not at all, brethren! But if we have been in some degree led away along with those [pagans] (for we share the same creation with them, if not the same error), yet let us be led back and be led astray no more. Those who have fallen may stand again, and to stand again is to be safe and better than those who have not fallen.

11. But we must return to the present celebration and make clearer the circumstances of the festival: for all obscurity is somehow distasteful. And since we cannot illustrate the whole without showing what went before, and this can only be done by representing the occasions and causes, and why and how those events went before and these followed after, I think my discourse should be arranged in this way. In the old days our affairs flourished, and flourishing, advanced, grew bright, were admired for their prime and extolled for their progress, and what was seen and said aroused the envy of all men and resounded gloriously to the ends of the earth: when the army was disciplined by Leo, and Achitophel lent his counsel, and Draco and Solon made our laws; when the mythical Muses (so to say) were known on earth and the War God was wounded; when ignorance was banished to the snare of Hades, and lawlessness to “the darkness of the oak” (as the saying is), along with the hands of Briareus; when the Race of Gold lived here, and all was happiness and enjoyment of divine blessings. Such was our state in the old days, and with it Bulgarian affairs flourished likewise and were vigorous (naturally, since the Bulgarians had become the adopted sons of our God and had already unlearnt the life of the wagon dweller and nomad and had learnt instead the Gospel of Grace), for so long as the scales were even and the Divine Eye was propitious, and calm held the sea, and wealth was wafted on a favoring gale.

12. But when the die fell on the other side, and the scales tipped up, and it was needful for misfortune to come and for the worse to prevail (either because good fortune had reached the ridge and therefore began to go downhill, or else because our sins came before God and cried out for the cup of drunkenness so that we might wake to

πέμπτου γένους,⁹¹ καὶ τῆς ἀπαύστου ταλαιπωρίας. αὐτίκα γάρ ὁ φιλοδοξίας ποταμός, ὁ τῆς προεδρίας τυφών, ὁ ύετός, ἡ νιφάς — οἵα καὶ μάλιστα τὸν Αἴμόν τε καὶ τὸν Ἰστρὸν κλονεῖ — τῇ τοῦ ἄρχοντος προσεβρύη ψυχῇ, καὶ ὁ σεισμός, ὃσου καὶ οἱ ἐπέκεινα Γαδείρων ἐπύθοντο. εὐθὺς οὖν τὸ στέφος καὶ ὁ δίφρος ἐθριαμβεύετο, στέφος ὁ τὴν Εύρωπην ἀπεστεφάνωσε καὶ πολλῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἔρριψε κάρηνα.⁹² Τὸν ἔξῆς ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡ ἀποστασία μᾶλλον, ἡ γάρ ἀνάρρησις καὶ τ' ἄλλα, οἷς ἡ σφραγὶς ἐβεβήλωτο, καὶ ὠδίνετο τὸ κακὸν καὶ τὰ γεννήματα τοῦ τεκόντος 315 ἔξιδιάλεται καὶ ἀθετεῖ μὲν τὸν πατέρα, ἀθετεῖ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα δι' οὗ ὁ ἀρρέφαβὼν τῆς υἱότητος.

fol. 48

13. ‘Ο δέ — καὶ γάρ ὁ προήδει διαπυνθάνεται — εἴργει τέως τοὺς τῆς συγκλήτου τὸ κράτος τιμῶν καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν χαρισάμενον, δὲ τῇ τοῦ | ‘Αιδου κυνέη συγκαλυπτόμενος⁹³ τοὺς συνεόρτους αἰτεῖ 320 καὶ εἰς ἴσχυν τὴν διαθήκην προτείνεται, ὁ δ' ἀντιτείνεται, βασιλέα προσκυνεῖσθαι σαφῶς ἔρῶν εἰ μὴ ‘Ρωμαῖον ‘Ρωμαίοις ἀπώμοτον· “ἢ βραχὺ τιθεῖς τὸ περινοηθέν σοι διάδημα προσκυνητὰς ἔχε τοὺς συνεόρτους.” καὶ τίς τάς ἐνθυμήσεις τε καὶ προτάσεις, τίς δὲ τάς ἐπιβολὰς ἐκείνου ἔξαριθμήσαιτο; οἶδα, φησὶν δὲ μῦθος, “ψάμμου τ' ἀριθμὸν καὶ 325 μέτρα θαλάσσης,”⁹⁴ ἄλλὰ καὶ ὡς εἰδέναι τὰ ἐκείνου ἀμήχανον, οἷς καὶ δίχα σιδήρου διὰ βίου τὸν Ἀδερ ὑπεκράτει τε καὶ ἀνέστελλεν. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν τὴν εἰρήνην τιμῶν καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἔτι τιμώμενος ἀστασίαστος τοῖς ἀστασιάστοις ἐφίσταται, καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἵχνεσιν ἐπιβάς συναποίχεται, τῷ παιδὶ τὰ σκῆπτρα λιπῶν καὶ ἀριστοκρατείαν ὑφάψας τὴν 330 ἥβην τῷ νέῳ προσμένουσαν. καὶ ἵνα τὰ πλείω σιγῶ, τὰς Ἱερατικὰς καὶ φιλοθέους ἐπιστολὰς καὶ τὸ συμβοσκηθῆναι λύκον μετὰ ἀρνός, τῇ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰρήνη καλῶς προρρήθεν⁹⁵ τε καὶ τελεοθέν ἐπὶ τοῖς παροῦσι[ν δ] μεθεῖλον καὶ μεθημάνευον αἴμασι, τοὺς συκοφαντοῦντας τὰ τοῦ κράτους ἀπόρρητα, τοὺς Ἱερεμίας ἐκείνων καὶ Ἡσαΐας, τοὺς λόγω 335 Ζωπύρους,⁹⁶ ἔργω δὲ δειλοτέρους τοῦ παρακύπτοντος, τοὺς βουλεύοντας κατὰ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἑαυτοῖς ἀποφέροντας, τ' ἄλλα οἷς ἡγόμεθά τε καὶ ἐφερόμεθα καὶ ὡς οἱ πίνοντες οἴνον κατ' ἀλλήλων ἐψάλλομεν τραγῳδίαν⁹⁷ ποιούμενοι τὰ ἥμέτερα.

310 ὁ σεισμός corr. Us: τὸν σεισμόν V || 315 ἀθετεῖ δὲ V: εὐθετεῖ leg. Us || 318 an αὐτῷ? Du || 323 ἐπιβολὰς V Jk: ἐπιβουλὰς Us || 329 ὑφάψας V Us: ἐφάψας Jk || 330 τὴν ἥβην: τὴν ἥδη susp. Jk || 333 παροῦσι[ν δ] Jk || 337 οἱ om. Us

⁹¹ Hesiodus, *Op.* 174.

⁹² Cf. Homerum, *Il.* 11.500.

⁹³ Cf. Homerum, *Il.* 5.845; Zenobius I.41: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 15 sqq.

⁹⁴ Zenobius I.80: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 27.

⁹⁵ Is. 11:6; 65:25.

⁹⁶ Herodotus III.154.

⁹⁷ Ps. 68:13.

dreadful nausea), then, alas for the Fifth Race and for misery unceasing! For at once the torrent of vainglory, the whirlwind of ambition, the rainstorm and the snowstorm (such as especially disturbs Haemus and Danube) swept into the heart of the Archon, and the earthquake came that was felt by those beyond the Pillars of Hercules! At once Crown and Throne were led captive away, the Crown that discrowned Europe and "cast the heads of many down upon the earth." Then followed insurrection, or rather apostasy: for the proclamation came, and the other [titles] with which he profaned his seals, and the evil was born, and he appropriated the fruits of his father, and rejected his father, and rejected the Spirit in which lay the pledge of his sonship.

13. But he, after enquiry of what he knew already, excluded for that time the lords of the Senate, out of his reverence for the imperial office and for Him Who gave it. But he, hidden beneath his helmet of darkness, called for fellow celebrants and proposed the confirmation of the covenant. But he opposed this and said straight out that it was abominable for Romans to do obeisance to an emperor unless he was a Roman; "rather, wear your makeshift diadem for a little, and let your fellow celebrants do you obeisance." Who could number the devices, the expedients, the impositions of that man? "I know," says the tale, "the number of the sand and the measurements of the sea"; but it is impossible to tell the devices whereby, without force, he cunningly mastered and restrained Hadad all through his life. Well: so he, honoring peace and as yet honored by it, quietly took rule over a quiet folk, and the Brother went off by the same way he had come, leaving the scepter to the child and attaching the 'aristocracy' to the youth to whom it already pertained. I will not speak at length of the priestly and pious letters; of the wolf pasturing with the lamb, in the peace according to the Gospel that was fairly foretold and has been consummated in our own time, <which they> wrested and reinterpreted in blood; of the traducers of imperial secrets; of those that played Jeremiah and Isaiah to him; of those that were in profession as brave as Zopyrus but in fact more cowardly than any who wink and look aside; of those that took counsel against the Council and engrossed all power among themselves; and of the other misfortunes by which we were harried and destroyed, when, like those that drink wine, we intoned dirges against one another and turned our affairs into tragedy.

fol. 48v

14. Ἐαλλ' ἡκεν ἡμῖν δὲ νέος Πρωτεύς,⁹⁸ καὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ ποικιλώτερος, διὸ ἐπιθεῖναι λίθῳ λίθον τῷ πατρῷ δόμῳ μὴ κεκτημένος, μὴ ἐπιστάμενος τὸν Χριστοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν κλῆρον, τὸ περιούσιον σχοίνισμα,⁹⁹ τημελεῖν ἐπηγγέλλετο καὶ πλατῦναί γε τημελούμενος. καὶ δὴ ἀναβάσεις ἀλλοκότους ἐν ψυχῇ διαθέμενος καθ' ἑαυτοῦ κινεῖ τὸν ἀναγύρον¹⁰⁰ καὶ τοὺς παραστήσαντας τὴν ἔω καὶ τὴν ἐσπέραν, οἵμοι, ἐλάφῳ τῷ γαμβρῷ παραθεῖς ἡγουμένῳ κατὰ ἕκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ μονιοῦ διεξάγεται καὶ ἀναρρίπτει τὴν κόνιν καὶ ὑπανάπτει τὸ πῦρ, οὗ καὶ τῦν αἱ φλόγες διαθέουσιν ἄσβεστοι.

15. Ἐπεὶ δὲ πυρὶ τὸ πῦρ δυσανάλωτον, ἔξ οὐδατος ἀναλαμβάνει Θεὸς τὸν Μωσῆν¹⁰¹ καὶ ταῖς ἐπιστάταις πιεζομένῳ τῷ 350 Ἰσραὴλ¹⁰² φέρων ἐφίστησι, τὴν νομὴν σβέσαι, τὸν Φαραὼ σχῆσαι, τοὺς τριστάτας¹⁰³ ἀπῶσαι καὶ τὸν Ἰακὼβ οἴκον ἐπανασώσασθαι. ἐντεῦθεν — καὶ γάρ εἰ σιγῶμεν ἡμεῖς, τὰ ἄψυχα φεύγεται¹⁰⁴ — εὔθυνται φιλοτιμίαι, διανομαί, βουλευτήρια, φόροι κοπτόμενοι, τὸ ἄδικον τυραννούμενον, Ναζηραῖοι¹⁰⁵ δύμοδος ὑπῆντες, τὸ ἀπερίσπαστον | βοηθούμενον, οἵ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐν τιμαῖς, ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ τὸ ἄμουσον, τὸ πᾶν ἐπὶ γόνῳ κλιθὲν¹⁰⁶ ἀνορθούμενον τὸ μείζον, αἱ πρὸς τὸ κατεπείγον πρεσβεῖαι, τῦν μὲν ἥδουσαι, τῦν δὲ στύφουσαι, καὶ τότε μὲν πτοοῦσαι, τότε δὲ θαρρύνουσαι, ὑπαλείφουσαι, προσάγουσαι, πλύνουσαι, πάντα λίθον κινοῦσαι,¹⁰⁷ τὸν δὲ τρόπω τὸν θῆρα προσάξανται· τοῖς γάρ ποικίλοις τὸ 360 μονοειδὲς ἀνήρμοσται, δὲ δῆλον κἄν μεταβάλλεται, τοιοῦτον γάρ δὲ πολύτροπος.

16. Καὶ παρουσιάσας εὔθυνται τὸ κράτος. καὶ ὡς τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως καὶ γενναιότητος· τῇ μὲν γάρ Θεῷ, τῇ δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν πεποιθώς, καὶ τὸ ‘βούλομ’ ἔγω λαὸν εἶναι σόον ἢ ἀπολέσθαι¹⁰⁸ ἔργω 365 διατρανῶν, ψιλὸς κατὰ τὸν Δαβὶδ¹⁰⁹ στιλβουμένοις τοῖς δόρασιν ἔδυνας,

339 δὲ Κωνσταντῖνος δὲ εὔνοῦχος mg. V || 343 τημελούμενος Us: -ούμενον VKu || 348 Ῥωμανὸν mg. V || 350 σχίσαι Us || 354 ἀπερίσπαστον VUs: ἀπερίσπαστον KuJk || 357 καὶ τότε δὲ Us || 358 πλύνουσαι om. Us || 360 δῆλον coni. Jk: δῆλῳ VUs || 363 ἡμῖν V: ὑμῖν Us || 365 δόρασιν V: θώραξιν Us

⁹⁸ Karathanasis (*supra*, 18), 9, p. 23; H. Herter, *RE*, XXIII, coll. 940–75, praelestim 967 sqq.

⁹⁹ Ps. 104:11.

¹⁰⁰ Zenobius II.55: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 46.

¹⁰¹ Exod. 2:5.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. I Cor. 14:7.

¹⁰² Exod. 1:11.

¹⁰⁵ Dujčev (*supra*, 19), 380.

¹⁰³ Exod. 14:7.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Aeschylus, *Pers.* 930.

¹⁰⁷ Zenobius V.63: Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 146; Diogenianus Epicur. VII.42: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 293.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Homerum, Il. 1.117.

¹⁰⁹ I Regn. 17:43–44.

14. But, well: there came among us this new Proteus, yet more various than the old, who had not one stone to set upon another for building his father's house, who knew not the heritage of Christ our great God and Savior, His Peculiar Portion. He undertook to take care of it, and to increase it by his care. And so he devised monstrous ambitions in his heart, and "moved the stinkweed against himself", and, alas, entrusted the conquerors of east and west to the command of his deerhearted brother-in-law, and moved against the wild boar in the woods, and kicked up the dust and lit the fire whose flames even now run wide and unquenched.

15. But since fire is hardly quenched by fire, God raised up Moses out of the water and brought him and set him over Israel that was pressed by her taskmasters, to quench the spreading flames, to check Pharaoh, to eject the counsellors and to redeem the house of Jacob. Thereupon (and even though I should be silent, senseless things will cry it aloud) at once came good government, largess, distribution of bounties, wise counsellors, tax relief, injustice repressed, Nazarenes agreeing, the defenseless succoured, the virtuous held in honor, the ignorant dishonored, everything that was beaten to the knee raised up; what is more, embassies were made to meet the urgent crisis, some successful, some gloomy, some daunting, some encouraging — soothing, inviting, "turning every stone," with the single aim of alluring the wild beast (for instability is out of harmony with singularity, which, though it may change shape, remains plain: that is the meaning of "versatile").

16. And when he appeared among us, he at once demanded imperial power. And oh! your faith and courage! Trusting both in God and in us, and putting into action that saying, "I will that my people be saved and not destroyed," you went, like David, naked among the shining

δ δ', οἷον τὸν Γοιλάδῳ ἀκούομεν,¹¹⁰ μετὰ τῆς ἀλαιζονείας ἔπεισι, καὶ τῶν
ծπλων προηγουμένων ἐπὶ τὴν φιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ πολλὰ μὲν βαρβαρίζων,
πλείω δὲ σολοικίζων, εἴτα τὸ δέον ἀκούσας, τῇ νόστεραί διαθέσθαι
συνθείς ἀπολλάττεται. καὶ ὡσπερ τὰ τῶν θηρίων ωμότερα, ἐπάν
370 ἀπορῶσι τοῖς βάλλουσι, πρὸς τὰ βέλη διαγωνίζονται, οὕτω καὶ οὗτος
μετὰ τῆς ἔχθρας ἀποκρουσθείς τοῖς δρυμοῖς τὸν χόλον ἀπέσκηψε. τὸν
μὲν οὖν' Ιεσσαὶ παῖδα μετὰ τὸ χρῖσμα καὶ τὴν ἐπίπνοιαν ὅμως οὐκ εἴσι
Θεός οὐδὲ θεμέλιον πῆξαι τῷ οἰκῳ¹¹¹ — εἰ γάρ τὸ ἔξ Αἰγύπτου παραιτεῖ-
ται σιδήριον,¹¹² πῶς αἵματων χεῖρα προστήσεται; τῷ μέντοι παιδὶ τελέσαι
375 τὸ ἔργον προτρέπεται, ἵσως δι τῶν τοιούτων ἀνέπαφος. οὕτω μοι
δοκεῖ καὶ αὐτὸν ἔξ ἥβης τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐνασκηθέντα εἰς τὸ οὔτω σεπτόν
ἔργον οὐ παραδέξασθαι, διὸ τῷ αὐτοῦ μᾶλλον ἐπευδοκεῖ παιδὶ κατανύ-
σαι τὸ βούλημα.

17. Ἡκεν οὖν αὐτόμολος ὅτι ἐκεῖθεν τὸ ὄρμημα. καὶ

380 ύμεις τὸ πατρῶον τειχίον χερσὶ διασπάσαντες καὶ χείλεσι χείλη προσ-
πτύξαντες, καὶ χερσὶ χεῖρα λαβόντες, ἐσπείσασθε, ἐπιστώσασθε, καὶ οἱ
λόγοι μετὰ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ καλῶς ἡ διαθήκη ἐπισφραγίζεται. οὕτω
χθές καὶ σήμερον τὰ ἡμέτερα. οὕτω κατὰ τοῦ νείκους νίκος ἡράμεθα καὶ
κατὰ τῆς ἔχθρας στήλην περιόπτον ἀνηγείραμεν καὶ πεφήναμεν οἱ κατ'
385 ἀλλήλων ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων, οἱ μετὰ τῆς ἀφροσύνης ἐν σωφροσύνῃ, οἱ τῆς
διαθήκης ὁμόκληροι, οἱ ἐνεδρεύοντες συνεδρεύοντες, οἱ μετὰ τῆς ἀπονοίας
ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ. καὶ ἵνα πάλιν διὰ τὸ περιχαρὲς ἀνακυκλῶμεν ἐπὶ τοῖς
αὐτοῖς, οἱ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἐνικώτατοι, οἱ διαιρεθέντες κακῶς καλῶς συναιρού-
μενοι, οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας κατὰ τοῦ ψεύδους, Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ Σαμάρεια
390 σύνηνομοι,¹¹³ πάντες ἐν κοινότητι φιλαδελφίας καὶ ὁμονοίας.

18. Ταῦτα καὶ ὁ βλέπων, προβλέπων, ἔόρταζε, Σιών, τὰς ἑορτάς σου,¹¹⁴ διακελεύεται, πολυσυνθρώπους ἄγε τὰς πανηγύρεις, πλήθουσι τὰ δριά σου εἰρήνης, καὶ δόμοφροσύνης αἱ ἀγοραί σου· οὐ μὴ προσθῶσιν ἐλθεῖν εἰς παλαιώσιν,¹¹⁵ ὅτι Κύριος ἐπελήψατο. ἴδού τὰ δστᾶ διεσκορπισμένα παρὰ τὸν "Αἰδην καὶ ἄνικμα σάρκα καὶ δέρμα καὶ τένοντας περιβάλλεται,¹¹⁶ καὶ ὁ οἶκος Ἰακώβ προσλαβὼν δρῆ τὴν ἀνάστασιν,¹¹⁷ καὶ υῦν ἡ ἐσχάτη δόξα τοῦ οἴκου Κυρίου ὑπὲρ τὴν πρώτην, ὅτι εὐδόκησε Κύριος. ἄρτι μὲν αἰῶνα καὶ τὰ μετέωρα καθαρώτερα καὶ τὸ γῆς πρόσωπον ἀνθηρότερον. ἄρτι δὲ καὶ κρῆναι πηγάζουσι ποτιμώτερον, καὶ γῆ

διαθήκης [ἀκληροί] suppl. Jk || 390 κοινότητι Ku: καινότητι VUs ||

III Regn. 17:4 sqq.

III 1 Par. 22:7-10.
11² III Baum 6:7

112 *III Regn.* 6:7.
113 Cf. *Ivan* 4:9.

¹¹³ Cf. Joan. 4:9.

¹¹⁴ Nah. 1:15.

¹¹⁵ Nah. 1:15.

116 Ez. 37:8.

117 Agg. 2:9.

spears; and he, as we hear of Goliath, came on with his boasting, and, with his armed men before him, yielded to friendship. He spoke much in a barbarous accent and made many more errors in grammar; then listened to what he had to hear; and on the morrow departed, having agreed to make peace. And as most savage beasts, unable to come at their pelters, worry the missiles, so he, repulsed in his enmity, slaked his wrath on the forest trees. Now, God did not allow the son of Jesse, even after his anointing and blessing, so much as to lay the foundation stone of His temple (for if He rejects the iron out of Egypt, how shall He admit the hand of blood?), but commanded his son to fulfill the work, perhaps because he was stainless of such bloodshed. In the same way, I think, God did not allow him, exercised as he was from his youth in such pursuits, to enter on a work so holy; and, instead, approved that his son should perform His will.

17. And so he came unbidden, for the impulse was from God. And you broke down the middle wall that his father had built, and kissed his lips with yours, and took his hand in your hands, and made a truce with him and gave him your pledge, and promise was sealed with promise and fairly the covenant was ratified. Such are our affairs of yesterday and today; thus have we won victory over strife and reared a far-seen monument over enmity; we that were hostile are seen to be friends; we that were mad, sober; we that were <without portion> in the covenant are partners in it; we that sat in ambush sit side by side; we that were in desperation are in harmony. Or, to recapitulate these matters out of our excess of rejoicing: we that are of the One are most unified, we who were evilly divided are fairly composed, we that are of the truth stand against the false; Jerusalem and Samaria are allies, and all are in community of brotherly love and concord.

18. These things the seer foreseeing bids you "celebrate your festivals, O Sion, lead your thronging processions!" Your borders are full of peace, and your meeting places of concord. They shall not add that they are coming to old age, because the Lord has laid hold on them! Behold, the bones scattered in death are being clad in moist flesh and skin and sinews; and the House of Jacob beholds in advance the resurrection! And now the last glory of the House of the Lord is beyond the first, for the Lord has favored it. Now are the ether and the sky more clear, and

400 καὶ θάλασσα τὰ ἔαυτῶν ἀφθονώτερον νέμουσιν. ἄρτι δὲ δρῦς ἀληθῶς,
ἄκρη μέν τε φέρει βαλάνους, μέση δὲ μελίσσας, καὶ τὰ θρέμματα τοῖς
πόκοις καταβαρύνεται.¹¹⁸ νῦν ἡ ἀποικία ἐγκατοικίζεται καὶ θεμέλιον
τίθησι καὶ ὅροφον ὑπερτίθησι, καὶ ἀνεγείρει τὴν γῆν, καὶ καταβαθύνει
φυτὰ καὶ κρύπτει σπέρματα, καὶ ἔξελαύνει τῶν ἀγγείων ἀράχνια καὶ
405 ταῖς ἐλπίσι συντρέφεται. νῦν ὁδοὶ πλήθουσιν ὁδοιπόρων καὶ ἀμνοὶ καὶ
μόσχοι ταῖς νάπαις περισκιρτῶσιν ὡς ἥδιστα. καὶ πάλιν τερπνὸς ὀλκὸς
ἀμάξης ἀκούεται. νῦν τὸ γῆρας ἀποξύεται γέρων καὶ ἀετὸς ὥσπερ
ἀνακαινίζεται,¹¹⁹ καὶ παῖδες ἀνδρίζονται, καὶ οἱ τῆς ἥβης πονοῦσιν
ἀκάματα. νῦν καὶ παρθένοι τῇ Μωσέως συνερχόμεναι Μαριάμ λιγυρὸν
410 ἄδουσι μέλος,¹²⁰ καὶ ἀλλήλας δεχόμεναι τὸν κατὰ τῆς ἔχθρας χορεύουσιν
ἐπινίκιον. νῦν καὶ τὸ εἶναι τερπνόν, καὶ τὸ βιῶντα τερπνότερον, καὶ
ἀνθρωποι κατὰ τοὺς πάλαι μακροβιώτεροι. οὕτω πάντα νεάλει, οὕτω
γάννυται καὶ τὸν αἴτιον τούτων ἀνυμνεῖ καὶ δοξάζεται. οἱ τῆς Ἀγαρ
μόνον οἰμώζουσι καὶ οἰμώζουσιν, οἱ καὶ μόνῳ τῷ ἕχοντα τῆς ἡμᾶν ὁμονοίας
415 τὰς καρδίας ἀφήρηνται.

fol. 49v

19. Καὶ τίς ὑψώθη τῆς εἰρήνης ἔκτος, τίς δὲ δίχα ταύτης
ἀπέλιπε δόξαν, εἰ μὴ τοῖς εὗ φρονοῦσιν ἐπίψυχον; | Σολομῶν δὲ Δαβὶδ
βασιλεύτατος οὐχ ὅτι σοφίαν καὶ βασιλείαν ἥρμοστο, ἀλλ' ὅτι Σατὰν
αὐτῷ διὰ βίου οὐκ ἦν· ἀνατελεῖ γάρ αὐτῷ πλῆθος εἰρήνης (ἀκούεις);¹²¹
420 ἔως δὲ πυρσὸς τῆς σελήνης σβεσθήσεται. καὶ ἴνα τὰ πᾶσι δῆλα παρά-
γωμεν, οἱ περὶ τὰς ἐμπορίας, καὶ κοινωνίας ἵσην προθυμίαν ἔχοντες οὐκ
ἵσασι τὸ διάφορον. δόδοιπόροις κουφίζει τὸν πόνον, καὶ δλίγον τὸ
διάστημα τίθησι καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὁμόνοια. πλωτῆρες καὶ λαίλαπος
καὶ κυμάτων καταφρονοῦσιν ὅταν ὁμοψύχως διαγωνίζωνται. καὶ διφρη-
425 λάται, εἰ μὴ ὁμοτρόπους ἀρμόσονται ἵππους, ποτ' ἀν τοὺς ἀντιτέχνους
ὑπερβαλοῦνται;¹²² καὶ φάναι καθόλου, εὐδαιμονίζουσιν ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις,
αἷς εἰρήνη προσεπικάθηται. ὅταν δὲ δῆμος τὸ αὐτὸν καὶ λέγη καὶ δια-
πράττηται καὶ τὸν καθ' ἓνα πειθῆ τῷ κοινῷ συμφρονεῖν ὑποδείγματι,
430 τούτους ὑποπτήσει μὲν εἴ τι πολέμιον, συνασπίζει δὲ καὶ Θεός· εἰ γάρ
μεταξὺ δύο συμφρόνων δρᾶται, δσω πολυανθρώπου πληρώματος.

20. Εἰ δὲ δεῖ τι καὶ τ' ἀναντία σκοπεῖν — τῇ γάρ τοῦ
κακοῦ παραθέσει τὸ καλὸν ἐκδηλότερον καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αἱρετώτε-
ρον — τοὺς Μήδους λάβε μοι καὶ τοὺς Πέρσας, ἔθνη τῶν τῆς Ἀσίας

401 τε om. Us || 403–4 καταβαθύνει — ἀράχνια ordine inverso Us ||
423 τίθησι καὶ: καὶ om. Us || πλωτῆρες corr. Us: πλωτῆρος V ||
424–25 διφρηλάται corr. Us: διφρελάται V || 433 λαβέ Us

¹¹⁸ Hesiodus, *Op.* 233–34.

¹²¹ Ps. 71:7.

¹¹⁹ Ps. 102:5.

¹²² Cf. Platonem, *Phaedr.* 253–54.

¹²⁰ Exod. 15:20.

the face of the earth more smiling. Now the springs well up with purer water, and earth and sea supply their fruits more abundantly. Now in truth the oak tree "bears acorns at its top, and bees in its middle, and the sheep are weighed down with their fleece." Now the homeless return home, and lay the foundation, and set the roof above, and turn the soil, and deepen the crop, and hide the seed, and drive out the cobwebs from the vessels, and are nourished with hope. Now the roads are thronged with wayfarers; and lambs and calves frolic in the dales most gladsomely; and pleasant it is once more to hear the turning of the wagon's wheel. Now the old man puts off his age and is renewed like the eagle, and children grow to man's estate, and the youths labor without tiring. Now virgins, going along with Miriam the sister of Moses, sing a shrill melody, and hand in hand dance the dance of triumph over enmity. Now is existence joyous, and life more joyous still, and men are more long-lived after the ancient pattern. So are all things made new and sparkling, and hymn and glorify the Cause of this. Only the sons of Hagar mourn and shall mourn, who are bereft of heart at the mere echo of our concord.

19. Who hath been exalted without peace, and who without her hath left behind a name other than odious to men of sense? Solomon, son of David, was most kingly, not because he united wisdom with kingship, but because during his life Satan was not: "there shall arise upon him abundance of peace (do you not hear?) until the torch of the moon be quenched." And — to mention examples manifest to all — those employed in trade or commerce who show an equal readiness know no dissension. Mutual concord lightens the traveler's labor and makes short his journey. Seamen make light of the tempest and waves when they strive with a common purpose. How shall charioteers, unless their yoke of horses be of one mind, ever surpass their rivals in the art? In a word, happy are those nations and cities over whom peace presides. When the populace is at one in word and deed and persuades each member to conform to the common pattern, all enmity cowers before them, and God takes their part: and if this be true of two that are like-minded, how much more true is it of a company of thousands?

20. But if we should consider the opposite condition — for good is more plain and thus more desirable if we compare it with evil — take the Medes and Persians,

fol. 50

δλβιώτερά τε ἔθνῶν ἀλκιμώτερά τε καὶ ἰσχυρότερα, οἵ τῆς εἰρήνης τὸν
 435 πόλεμον προστησάμενοι καὶ τάδε μὲν αἱροῦντες, τάδε δὲ καταστρέφοντες, οὔτω συγκατεστράφησαν, ὡς μηδὲ πυρφόρον αὐτοῖς λειφθῆναι,¹²³
 μηδὲ βλαστῆσαι θαλόν, κατὰ γάρ τὸν πεύκης τρόπον ὀλόρριζοι διεφθάρησαν.¹²⁴ Πάρθους δὲ τοὺς κατὰ τὰς Πύλας ἀκούμεν παντοίων πολέμων
 440 εἰδήμονας· οὐ γάρ ὑπὸ Λυγὸν ἄγουσι βόσι, οὐδὲ δισχίζουσιν ἄρουραν,
 οὐδέ τι τῶν τῆς εἰρήνης σεβάζονται, ἀλλ’ ἔτι νήπιοι τόξοις ἐθίζουσι,
 δόρατα θήγουσι, πεζομαχίαις, ἵππομαχίαις, φυγαῖς, διώξειν ἔναθλεύουσιν, οὐ μὴ φάγωσιν ἐὰν μὴ τῷ πολέμου νόμῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν
 ἐφιδρώσωσι;¹²⁵ καὶ ὅμως τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἡττηθέντες αἷχμῃ αὐτοῖς ὅπλοις
 445 καὶ τούνομα προσαπάλεσαν. τί δὲ τοὺς περὶ τὸν Νεῖλον Θηβαίους
 διελυμήνατο; ἔως γάρ τοῖς ὁμόροις συνέβαινον, τήν τε Χρυσῆτιν ἐπεῖχον
 καὶ τάλλα τοῦ Νείλου ἐνέμοντο, ἐπεὶ δέ πως ἐφυσιώθησαν καὶ περὶ τοὺς
 γείτονας ἔσκασαν. ἴστε τὴν Καμβύσου στρατείαν καὶ τὸν ἐκεῖθεν τούτοις
 ἐπιπολάσαντα ὄλεθρον, οὐ τὴν κεφαλὴν οὐκέτι διαιρουσιν.¹²⁶ δέ μέντοι
 450 τὴν ὄφρὺν Ζέρξης αἰθέριος ἐπεὶ κατὰ Λακεδαιμονίων | ἔξεμην, γῆν μὲν
 ὑπερέθηκεν ἀλλην τῇ θαλάσσῃ μετέωρον¹²⁷ καὶ μηχανῇ ἔνη τὰς μυριάδας
 ἡρίθμει,¹²⁸ ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ ἔργον μετὰ τῆς αὐθαδείας [...], τὰς μυριάδας
 ἀποβαλὼν οὐδὲ χιλιάσι τὰ Σοῦσα κατέλαβε. καὶ παρίημι τὰ Ἐτεοκλέους
 455 καὶ Πολυνείκους τῶν Οἰδίποδος, οἵ τῆς Θηβαίων ἀρχῆς προμαχόμενοι,
 ἀλλήλους ἀνεῖλον.¹²⁹ ἐῶ καὶ Κύρον τὸν ἔσχατον, δος Δαρείω τῷ Ἀρτα-
 ξέρχου διαφερόμενος καὶ τὴν εύτυχίαν οὐ φέρων, τῷ δυστυχούντι πεσών
 460 τὴν ἀρχὴν προεξένησε.¹³⁰ καὶ τὸν λίβυν Ἀνταῖον ἀφόμεν, δος ἀναιρῶν
 τοὺς ἐπιξενουμένους ὁψὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιξενωθεὶς Ἡρακλεῖ τῆς ξενίας εὗρε
 τάπιχειρα.¹³¹ τίς δὲ τὸν Φιλίππου παῖδα, τὸν ἀκάθεκτον ἐκείνον καὶ
 μαχιμώτατον οὐκ ἐπίσταται, δος σχεδὸν τὴν οἰκουμένην παραστησάμε-
 465 νος καὶ τῷ δημιουργῷ ἐπεμέμφετο ὅτι μὴ μᾶλλον τὸν γῦρον τῆς γῆς
 ἐπλατύνατο, ὡς οὐχ ἱκανοῦ τοῦ νῦν ὅρωμένου τῷ ἐκείνου συνεκτείνεσθαι
 δόρατι,¹³² ἀλλὰ καὶ δος πρὸς τῷ μηδέν τι τῆς ἀπληστίας ἀπόνασθαι,

434 ὀλβιώτερα τε *mg.* V || 436–37 μηδὲ...μηδὲ corr. Us: μὴ
 δὲ...μὴ δὲ V || 437 ὀλόρριζοι corr. Us: δλόριζοι V || 440 τόξοισι
 Us || 446 post ἐνέμοντο lac. susp. Jk || 447 ἔσκασαν: ἔσκαιώρησαν
 coni. Us || 448 ἐπιπολάσαντα corr. Us: ἐπιπολώσαντα V || 451
 post αὐθαδείας lac. susp. Us || 460: ἐπεμέμφετο corr. Us: ἐπεμ-
 φέτο V || 462 δος: ὡς Us || τῷ Us || ἀπόνασθαι Us

¹²³ Zenobius V.34: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 134–35.

¹²⁴ Zenobius V.76: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 150–51.

¹²⁵ Cf. Julianum Justinum, *Epit. Hist. Philippicarum* XLI.2–3.

¹²⁶ Cf. Herodotum III.1–4, etc.

¹²⁷ Herodotus VII.34.

¹²⁸ Herodotus VII.60.

¹²⁹ Aeschylus, *Septem contra Theb.* 810.

¹³⁰ Xenophon, *Anab.* I.viii.27.

¹³¹ Apollodorus II.v.11 (Loeb ed., 222).

¹³² Ex fonte incert.

nations more rich, more courageous, more powerful than any of those of Asia, who, preferring war to peace, and choosing the former and destroying the latter, were themselves destroyed with it, so that not a fire carrier was left behind nor a shoot to sprout: for like a pine tree they were withered root and branch. We read that the Parthians at the Gates were masters of all sorts of fighting: "for they harness no oxen under the yoke, nor do they cleave the soil, nor respect any of the arts of peace; but even as infants they practice with bows, sharpen spears, exercise themselves in fighting on foot and on horseback, in flight and pursuit; nor will they eat save in the sweat of their face in warrior fashion." And yet, defeated by the Roman spear, they lost name, arms, and all. What destroyed the Thebans about the Nile? For so long as they agreed with their neighbors, they kept to Chrysitis and dwelt in the other districts of the Nile. But, when in some way they became puffed up and were vexatious to their neighbors, you know of the expedition of Cambyses and the destruction that thence overflowed upon them, and they lift up their head no more. When Xerxes in his pride was enraged against the Lacedaemonians, he placed another earth on high above the sea and numbered his myriads by a strange device; but because he <approached> the work with arrogance, he lost his myriads and arrived back in Susa with not even thousands. I omit the story of the sons of Oedipus, Eteocles and Polyneices, who, fighting over the rule of Thebes, slew one another. I pass by the last Cyrus, who quarreled with Darius, son of Artaxerxes (*sic*), and had no luck, but fell and yielded his rule to the loser. Let us ignore the Libyan Antaeus who slew his guests and at last, entertained by Hercules, received the wages of his hospitality. But who knows not Philip's son, that uncontrollable and most warlike man, who, after conquering almost all the world, reproached the Creator for not having given the earth a wider circuit, since, as it now is, it was not sufficient to measure with his spear; and who not merely reaped no

‘Ολυμπιάδα τε τὴν μητέρα καὶ Περδίκκαν καὶ Ἀντίπατρον τοὺς ἐπιτηδείους καὶ τὸ γένος ὁμοῦ καὶ τὴν Μακεδονίαν δλην ἀπώλεσεν, εὐθὺς
465 αὐτῷ συνδιαλυθέντος τοῦ κράτους καὶ Ἰταλοῖς προχωρήσαντος.

fol. 50v

21. Τοιαῦτα τὰ τῆς ἔχθρας ἐπίχειρα. οὕτω τιμᾶ τοὺς τιμῶντας αὐτήν, οὕτω δεξιοῦται τοὺς αὐτῇ προσανέχοντας, τοιούτῳ τέλει, τοιαύταις ἀμειψεσι. καὶ τίς εἰ μὴ Κορύβου ἡλιθιώτερος¹³³ οὐκ ἀποτρόπαιον αὐτήν, οὐκ ὀλέθριον, οὐ τῆς “Υδρας αὐτῆς,¹³⁴ Σκύλλης αὐτῆς,¹³⁵ οὐ πάντων ἀτόπων ἀτοπωτέραν ἡγησοίτο; ἀφρήτωρ, ἀθέμιστος¹³⁶ καὶ παράκοπος ὄντως καὶ κάρου καὶ παροινίας ἀνάπλεως, ὁ διχοστασίας καὶ πολέμων ἔρῶν. πλήρεις αἱ παροιμίαι τῶν ταύτης ἀπαγορεύσεων, ὁ προφητῶν Θίασος, ἥ καινότης, ἥ παλαιότης, ἥ Θύραθεν· μεσταὶ γάρ τῶν ταύτης κακῶν πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαί, πᾶσαι δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί, 475 μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα¹³⁷ καὶ λιμένες καὶ ὁ ἀήρ τυχόν ταῖς ὅρνιθῶν ἀντιθέσειν. ἔχθρας καὶ ἥ κλῆσις δυσώνυμος καὶ χείρων ἥ μνήμη, καὶ ἥ ἀρχὴ ἔτι χείριστος καὶ τὸ τέλος χειρότερον· τὸ συγγενὲς διαιρεῖ, τὸ ἀλλογενὲς οὐ προσίεται. τί οὐχὶ τελεῖ τῶν κακῶν; πατέρας ἐκμαίνει, παῖδας ἀνάπτει, κυμαίνει δήμους, διαιρεῖ χώρας, καταστρέφει πόλεις, 480 ψυχάς θηριοῖ, λύει τὰ σώματα. δρ' οὖν εἰσάμενοι ὅποιον ἥ μάχη κακὸν καὶ συμφορῶν ὄπόσων | αἰτίᾳ, οὐ καταβαλοῦμεν αὐτήν εἰς τὸν Τάρταρον, οὐκ ἀπορρίψουμεν εἰς τὸν Κέρβερον,¹³⁸ εἰς “Αἰδου ταμεῖα, εἰς βάραθρον ἀδηλίας; οὐ σωρὸν λίθων, καὶ θημῶνα γῆς συνεπιφορήσωμεν ἀνωθεν, οὐ κορμούς καὶ ὑλην καὶ ὃ τι που κατὰ χεῖρα συνεπιθήσωμεν, ὡς 485 ἐπαναστῆναι βουνὸν καὶ ἀναδραμεῖν ὅρος πάντων ὀρέων τραχύτερόν τε καὶ ὑψηλότερον, ἵνα καὶ πολλῶν ἀνελκόντων μαχίμων μηκέτι που διαφαίνηται; οὐ τῇ συνεχείᾳ τῶν ἀλγεινῶν πιεσθέντες, καὶ Στυγὸς καὶ Χιμαίρας,¹³⁹ καὶ τῶν Κύρβεως κακῶν,¹⁴⁰ καὶ Λαιστρυγόνων αὐτῶν¹⁴¹ καὶ τῶν Αἰγύπτου πληγῶν¹⁴² μᾶλλον αὐτήν βδελυξόμεθα; οὐ τὰ τῶν 490 προγόνων ἐπιμνησθέντες, οἷον τὰς πανηγύρεις ἐκείνας, τὰς ἑορτάς, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, τὴν ἀοχλίαν, τὰς ὀλιοφάτους νύκτας καὶ ὑμνωδίας, εἴτα καὶ τὰ τῦν ἐπικωμάσαντα προσεπιλογισάμενοι τὰς λεπλασίας, τὰς οἰμωγάς, τὰς καθημερινὰς μιαιφονίας, παραφυλαξόμεθα καὶ νοῦν καὶ ὕτα καὶ τὰς

463 Περδίκαν Us || 468 Κορύβου V: Κοροίβου corr. Us || 469 οὐ τῆς “Υδρας αὐτῆς, οὐ τῆς Σκύλλης Us || 479 χώρας Us: χορούς V || 481 καταβαλοῦμεν corr. Ku: καταναλοῦμεν VUs || 483 καὶ λίθων Us || συνεπιφορήσομεν Us || 484 συνεπιθήσομεν Us || 488 κύρβεως Us || 489 βδελυξόμεθα Us || 491 ἀοχλησίαν Us

¹³³ Zenobius IV.58: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 101.¹³⁴ Hesiodus, *Theog.* 313.¹³⁷ Cf. Hesiodum, *Op.* 101.¹³⁵ Homerus, *Od.* 12.222–59.¹³⁸ Hesiodus, *Theog.* 311.¹³⁶ Cf. Homero, *Il.* 9.63.¹³⁹ Homerus, *Il.* 6.179.¹⁴⁰ Zenobius VI.77: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 105.¹⁴¹ Homerus, *Od.* 10.80 sqq.¹⁴² Exod. 7:1 sqq.

reward from his insatiability, but also destroyed his mother Olympias, and Perdiccas and Antipater, his friends, together with his race and all Macedonia, since his empire at once perished with him and fell into the hands of Italians?

21. Such are the wages of enmity! So does she honor those who honor her; so does she reward those who cleave to her, with such an end, with such exchanges! And who (unless he were more foolish than Korybos) would not think her hateful, deathly, more monstrous than Hydra's or Scylla's own self, more monstrous than all monsters? Unsocial, lawless, a proper madman, replete with drunken torpor and folly, is he who loves division and wars! The proverbs are full of prohibitions against strife, as is the company of prophets, the world of today and yesterday, the pagan wisdom. "Full of her evils is every street, every meeting place of men, seas" and harbors, nay, even the air is full of the quarrelings of birds. Of enmity the name is ill-omened, and the memory worse still; her beginning is most evil, her end more evil yet. She divides the family and repels the foreigner. Of what ills is she not the cause? She inflames fathers and kindles the wrath of children, convulses peoples, destroys cities, ensavages souls, dissolves bodies. When we know how evil a thing is strife, and of how many disasters she is the cause, shall we not consign her to Tartarus, cast her to Cerberus, to the regions of Hades, to the pit of obscurity? Shall we not bring to cover her a mound of stones and a pile of earth; shall we not lay above her logs and rubble and whatever lies to hand, so that a hill shall arise and a mountain be piled up more rough and tall than all mountains else, so that though many stalwarts might try to drag her up, she shall never more appear? Shall we, oppressed by continuous griefs of Styx or of the Chimaera, by all the evils of the statute book, by the plagues of the very Laestrygons and of the Egyptians, not loathe her the more? Shall we not remember our forefathers, their holidays, their festivals, their freedom, their ease, their nights brilliant with illumination and the hymns they sang, and then compare them with the rout that has now rushed in upon us, the devastation, the lamentation, the daily murders; and so keep guard over our

αἰσθήσεις, είπειν, μηδὲν τῶν ταύτης ἔως καὶ λεπτοῦ παραδέξασθαι.

495 ἀλλ' ὀνδροφόνοις μὲν καὶ τοιχωρύχοις καὶ λωποδύταις καὶ ἀκολάστοις καὶ τῇ τοιαύτῃ φατρίᾳ, διὰ βίου τὰ πολλὰ τῆς κακίας ἀνέκφορα καίτοι θριάμβων πόσων ἐπάξια, ἡμεῖς δέ τι τῶν τῆς εἰρήνης παρακινήσωμεν, ἢ παραλύσωμεν, ἢ Λοκροὶ τὰς συνθήκας ἐσόμεθα, τὸ ἄδόμενον;¹⁴³ μὴ μηδαμῶς, ὃ φιλότης καὶ ἀδελφότης, δσοι τῆς σαγήνης τοῦ Λόγου καὶ

500 τῆς μερίδος τοῦ [Χριστοῦ], ἀλλ' δτι καὶ ποσῶς ἡλώμεθα τῷ κακῷ, σχετλιάζοιμεν, οὕτω γάρ καὶ δυσαλωτότεροι τοῖς ἔξῆς δραθείμεν. οὐκ ἔστι τῶν ἀμεινόνων οὐδὲν ἀμεινόν ὁμονοίας· τὰς σχέσεις φυλάσσει, τὰς διαφορὰς ἀναιρεῖ, χρηστεύεται, μεγαλοψυχεῖ, ῥυθμίζει τὸν βίον, οὐχ ὑπερτίθησιν ὅρους. τί τ' ἀλλα; Θεῷ συνάγει καὶ ἀγγέλοις τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν. οἵμαι λυσιτελεῖν καὶ ἐν ὕδασι διαιτωμένην αὔτην καὶ ἐν αἰθέρι,

505 ἐπει συνεδριάζει Θεῷ, καὶ Θεός, ὡς δέδεικται, τυχὸν ἔνεστιν. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν καὶ τὴν εὐπροφάσιστον ἔχθραν καὶ ὡς ἀν εἴποι τις εὔλογον, αὐθημερόν¹⁴⁴ εὶ οἶόν τε διαλύεσθαι, τῶν καλλίστων τίθεμαι τε καὶ ὑποτίθεμαι· ἔχθρα γάρ αύρίζουσα δύσλυτος. πλὴν εὶ μὴ φιλαίτιός τις ὑπών

510 τὰς ἀντινομίας ὡδίνει καὶ ὡδίνων γλῶσσαν δολίαν προβάλλεται — τί δὲ δοθεί σοι καὶ τί προστεθεί σοι πρὸς τοιαύτην γλῶσσαν, ἀλλ' ἢ τὰ τοῦ δυνατοῦ βέλη καὶ ταῦτα μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἐμπυριζόντων ἀνθράκων, ἀκήκοας;¹⁴⁵ εὶ δὲ λόγου μεγάλου δίχα καὶ ὑπὲρ ὄνου σκιᾶς τε καὶ παρακύψεως, τὸ θρυλλούμενον,¹⁴⁶ ἐπιφύεται, οὐδὲ φροντιστέον, οὐδὲ διασκεπτέον τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο, ἀλλ' αὐτοβοεὶ χωρητέον | πρὸς τὴν διάλυσιν καὶ προκαταβολῇ καὶ τὰς ρίζας διατμητέον. καὶ γάρ ἀρχομένων τῶν νόσων κατὰ τῶν αἰτίων ἰστάμεθα, ἀκμάζοντα γάρ πολλὰ παρέχεται πράγματα. ἐπεὶ δὲ Θεὸς τὴν μέν, οἵαν τὴν Νιόβην ἀκούομεν,¹⁴⁷ ἔθηκε, τῇ δὲ συγχορεύειν ἡμᾶς ἔδωκε, καὶ δεδωκώς συνεπελήψατο, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ

520 νοεῖν καὶ φρονεῖν καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ ἐπιτελεῖν ἔχαρίσατο, καὶ μίαν, οἷον εἰπεῖν, ψυχὴν ἐν ἀπείροις διένειμε σώμασι καὶ ἡμεῖς διὰ παραινέσεων ὅση δύναμις αὔτην ἐπισχύσαμεν.

fol. 51

500 [Χριστοῦ] suppl. Jk || 515 αὐτοβοεὶ corr. Us: αὐτοβοὶ V ||
520 καὶ φρονεῖν om. Us || 522 ἐπισχύσωμεν Us

¹⁴³ Zenobius IV.97, V.4: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 114, 116.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Eph. 4:26.

¹⁴⁵ Ps. 119:4.

¹⁴⁶ Zenobius V.39, VI.28: cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, I, 136–37, 169.

¹⁴⁷ Homerus, Il. 24.602.

hearts and ears and, in a word, our senses so that not the smallest trace of her shall be received among us? Even murderers, and burglars, and brigands, and lewd men and their crew preserve a lifelong secrecy about most of the evil they do, though disclosure might bring them so much reputation; and is it for us to disturb or dissolve any article of peace and become, as they say, Locrians in our covenants? No, by no means, my friends and brothers, who are converts of the Word and the portion of *<Christ>*! But now that once we have been caught in the evil, let us rue the day, for so shall we be less easily taken in the future. Of the better things none is better than concord: it guards affections, destroys differences, is honorable and magnanimous, regulates life, and does not overstep its limits. What else? It leads man toward God and His angels. I think it confers benefits when it dwells in the waters and in the air, since it is throned with God, and, as has been shown, God is perhaps in it. For my part, I posit and premise that among the fairest things is to dissolve today, if that be possible, even a seemingly just or, one might say, reasonable enmity: for the enmity that endures until the morrow is hard to break. But unless there lurk a captious man, who travails to bring to birth ambiguities of law and puts forth a treacherous speech from his travail (but what will be given and added to you in respect of such speech, if not the darts of the powerful and therewithal the coals that inflame, you have heard) — but even if he insists with great reason, over and above proverbial vanity and troublemaking, even so it should not be cared for or considered, but should be instantly dismissed at the very outset and its roots severed. We take our stand against the causes of sickness in its beginnings, for when these grow mature they bring about great troubles. And now that God has set the one [enmity] like Niobe in the fable, and given us to dance with the other [concord], and lent His support to His gift, and has granted us to think and speak and act in unity, and has, so to say, distributed a single soul among an infinity of bodies, then let us too, through exhortation, strengthen this spirit so far as we are able.

22. Δεῦτε καὶ ταῖς εὐχαῖς αὐτὴν ἔτι κρατύνωμεν, αὐτοῦ
 Μωσέως ἥγουμένου καὶ τῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἀμαλὴκ τύπῳ ἵλεουμένου,¹⁴⁸ τὸν
 525 εὐδιάλλακτον. πρόσχες ἐξ ἀύλου κατοικητηρίου σου, Κύριε, καὶ ἵδε τὰ
 χρήστα συνεστῶτά σοι σήμερον. οἱ διέστημεν ἀβουλίᾳ καὶ συνέστη-
 μεν εύδοκίᾳ σου, ἔπιδε τὰ διασπασθέντα μέλη τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ
 σου εἰς ὀλοκληρίαν ἀρμολογούμενα. ἔπαισας καὶ ἵσω ἡμᾶς, ἤλεγχας
 καὶ ἐπιστραφεὶς παρεκάλεσας.¹⁴⁹ ἐπύρωσας ἡμᾶς ὡς χρυσόν καὶ εἰς
 530 ἀναψυχὴν ὑπεξήγαγες.¹⁵⁰ ἔξομολογούμεθά σοι καὶ τῆς παιδείας καὶ
 τῆς ἀκέσεως. τίς γάρ ἐνατενίσοι τῇ ἀβύσσῳ σου τῶν κριμάτων,¹⁵¹ τὸ
 δὲ πλῆθος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου τίς ἔξυμνήσεται;¹⁵² διαλλάσσεις καρδίας
 ἀρχόντων, ἐν δὲ βουλῇ μενεῖς βουλευομένων,¹⁵³ ἐντέλλῃ, καὶ ὁ θαλάσσης
 535 κατευνάζεται σάλος,¹⁵⁴ ἐμπνεῖς, καὶ ἀνακαινίζεις τὰ ξηραινόμενα.¹⁵⁵ πάντα
 σου ὑπὲρ ἔννοιαν καὶ κατάληψιν. ἀλλ' ἔτι δοίης μηδὲν ὅ μὴ βούλει
 πεπονθέναι ἡμᾶς, μηδὲ παρολισθῆσαι τοῖς πρὶν ὀλισθήμασιν, ἀεὶ δὲ
 νεάλειν τε καὶ ἡβᾶν καὶ ἀκμάζειν τὰ δεδογμένα σοι σήμερον. εἰς αὐτὸς
 ἐν τρισὶ συμφυής τε καὶ δμοούσιος καὶ ἡμῖν τοῖς σοῖς δοίης ἐν σοὶ καὶ
 540 ἀλλήλοις ἐν εἶναι καὶ τὸ ἐν τοῦτο διαμένειν ἐπὶ σοὶ καὶ ἡμῖν ἀθάνατον
 καὶ αἰώνιον.

527 ἔτι δὲ Us || 533 μένεις Us || 536 μηδὲ corr. Us: μὴ δὲ V ||
 537 νεάλειν VDu: λεῖν Us

¹⁴⁸ Deut. 25:19.

¹⁴⁹ Ps. 71:21.

¹⁵⁰ Ps. 65:12.

¹⁵¹ Ps. 35:7.

¹⁵² Ps. 50:1.

¹⁵³ Prov. 15:22.

¹⁵⁴ Matt. 14:24. sqq.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Marc. 3:1 sqq.; Matt. 8:23 sqq.

22. Come hither, and with your prayers, strengthen it yet more, with Moses himself at your head, reconciling himself to the placable one after his example against Amalek. Behold from Thy spiritual dwelling place, Lord, and see those things that were divided yesterday made one by Thee today. We who were severed by unwise council are made one by Thy favor, and, moreover, the members of the body of Thy Christ that were torn apart are joined together in wholeness. Thou hast smitten and healed us; Thou hast convicted us, then turned toward us, and comforted us; Thou hast tried us as gold in the fire and hast drawn us out into coolness. We acknowledge to Thee our punishment and our healing. Who shall look into the depth of Thy judgments, who shall extol the multitude of Thy mercies? Thou reconcilest the hearts of rulers and abidest in the counsels of councillors. Thou commandest, and the surge of the sea is stilled; Thou inspirlest and revivest what was dried up. All Thy works are beyond thought and understanding. Mayst Thou give no more what Thou wouldest not we should suffer, nor may we slide in our former slipperinesses; but may Thy decisions of today ever live and flourish in youth and grow strong! Mayst Thou, that Thyself art One in Three, conatural and consubstantial, grant to us, Thy children, to be one in Thee and one another, and may this unity abide with Thee and us immortal and eternal!

COMMENTARY

(by line reference)

7–8: Cf. Ps. 67:7; Job 37:8.

14–15: δοῦλος προφήτης, i.e., the Prophet; cf. I Regn. 9:9.

16: τὸν εἰπόντα, i.e. Homer; cf. also Rom. 13:12.

17: ἐωσφόρος — Lucifer; Slavic, Dennica; see Is. 14:12.

19–21: Cf. Prov. 3:16–17.

24: The white dress is a symbol of joy; see also line 111.

28 and note 16: Endymion — see Roscher, *Lexikon*, I, cols. 1246–48; see also the Byzantine quotations by John Scylitzes and George Cedrenus, *Hist. comp.*, Bonn. ed., II (1839), 126 line 12; Leo Diaconus, *Hist.*, Bonn ed. (1828), 38 line 22; Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, Bonn ed. (1835), 772 line 19; Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist.*, Bonn ed., II (1832), 1061 line 14; III (1855), 133 line 6; 208 line 14; 427 line 13, etc.

29–30 and note 18: τοῦ ἐν Δωδώνῃ χαλκείου — cf. also Kern, in *RE*, V (1903), col. 1262.

39–40 and note 25: See also Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist.*, ed. Bonn, I (1829), 375 lines 6–9; 957 lines 2–4.

47ff: Cf. this general description of the damages of the war with II Esdr. 1:3ff.; Is. 24:1ff.; 64:10ff.; Ier. 18:21ff.; II Par. 36:17ff.; Ps. 77:63ff., etc.

49 and note 26: See also *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler (Leipzig, 1928–38), s.v.; *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1971), VI, cols. 804–6.

58 and note 28: See also *Suidae Lexicon*, s.v. Ἀσκραῖος.

62ff.: This is an allusion to the crisis in the Judaic Kingdom after the death of King Solomon (ca. 972 – ca. 932 B.C.), the son of David; cf. also II Par. 25:5ff.; 28:1ff.; Is. 11:13, etc.

67: τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον — i.e., Adam.

69 and note 33: Cf. also Ps. 136:6; Job 29:10; Lam. 4:4.

74: σύνοδος — ecclesiastical council, assembly, meeting.

74: συλλογή — (mundane) assembly, meeting; cf. N. Skabalanovič, in *Vizantijskoe gosudarstvo i cerkov' v XI vekе* (St. Petersburg, 1884), 138, 140 note 1.

74: διμιλία — homily, sermon, oration; cf. Ch. Du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis* (hereafter *Glossar. gr.*), s.v.

75: δημηγορία — public speech, harangue, oration; cf. *Glossar. gr.*, s.v.; Photius, *Epistolae*, ed. I. Valettes (London, 1864), § 31, p. 227.

82: τὸ κράτος — i.e., the Emperor (Romanus Lecapenus).

85–86: Cf. Photius, *Epistolae*, § 67, p. 237: Δεῖ τοιγαροῦν . . . τοῖς καιροῖς ίδίοις τὸ πρόσφορον ἀπονέμειν.

87 and note 34: Cf. also *Suidae Lexicon*, s.v., χωρίς; οὐδὲν τίττον.

93–94: Cf. Matt. 7:15 ff.

100: ὁ τῶν θρόνων — cf. *Glossar. gr.*, s.v. θρόνος — *cathedra, sedes episcopi in Ecclesia . . . , episcopatus, dignitas episcopi*.

101: ὁ τοῦ βήματος — see *Glossar. gr.*, s.v. οἱ τοῦ βήματος — *qui in synthrono, seu intra bema tis cancellos sedent, . . . dignitates ecclesiasticae*.

111: λευχειμονοῦντες — cf. Marc. 9:3; Apoc. 3:4–5; 3:18, 4:4; 7:9; 7:13–15; Act. 1:10; etc.

112: τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἱεράρχα ἐναριθμούμενοι — the clergy, members of the clergy, ordinary clergy.

112: τῆς γερουσίας ἀπτόμενοι — the members of the Byzantine senate; cf. C. Diehl, “Le sénat et le peuple byzantin au VII^e et VIII^e siècles,” *Byzantium*, 1 (1924), 201–13.

113: Μωάεως ἥγουμένου — the Emperor Romanus I Lecapenus.

113: Ἀαρών — the Patriarch of Constantinople, Stephen II (925–27).

122: χαλκόν — i.e., copper money; cf. Matt. 10:9; Marc. 6:8; 12:41; I Cor. 13:1; Apoc. 18:12; cf. also I. Dujčev, in *Izvestija na Instituta za būgarska istorija*, BAN, 3–4 (1951), 103ff. with bibliography.

128 and note 48: Cf. also Luc. 10:5–6.

133–34: ὁ ἐν πτορφυρίδι φιλόσοφος — i.e., the Prophet Solomon.

145–49 and note 54: See also Ps. 77:21ff; Sap. 16:20; Deut. 8:16.

152: Cf. Ps. 75:4; 45:10; Os. 2:18.

155–58: μεσότοιχον — cf. Nicholas Mysticus, *Epistolae*, PG, 111, cols. 61, 64, 84, 108, 121, 161, 193, etc.

165: Σκύθης — the “Scythian” here signifies Bulgarian; see G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica. II. Sprachreste der Türkvölker in den byzantinischen Quellen*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1958), 279–83, esp. 280, § 5; I. Dujčev, *Bulgarsko srednovekovie. Proučvanija vůrchu političeskata i kulturnata istorija na srednovekovna Bǔlgarija* (Sofia, 1972), 104ff.

172: τὸν τῶν Λιλανίων σπορέα — cf. Matt. 13:24ff.

173–74: τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ — concerning the “diaspora” (the dispersion) of the Jews, see Deut. 28:25; 30:4; Lev. 26:33; Joan. 7:35.

177ff.: Cf. III Reg. 3:11ff., 4:24ff., 5:12; Sir. 47:13ff.

203: οἱ τῶν τοῦ Ἀρίστονος ἀπαντλήσαντες — the followers of the philosopher Plato.

203–4: οἱ ... Σταγειρίτην καταπιόντες — the followers of Aristotle.

218 and note 71: The same idea is found in Teodoreto, *Terapia dei morbi pagani* IV.56ff., ed. N. Festa (Florence, 1931), 252ff. This text was translated into Old Bulgarian by John Exarcha; see *Das Hexaemeron des Exarchen Johannes*, ed. R. Aitzetmüller (Graz, 1958), 19ff.; I. Dujčev, *Estestvoznanieto v srednovekovna Bǔlgarija; sbornik ot istoričeski izvori* (Sofia, 1954), 96ff.

241–42: Cf. Gen. 2:7.

244: Cf. Gen. 1:26, 5:1, 9:6; Sap. 2:23; Sir. 17:3.

245: δὲ βουλήσει δεδημιουργημένος — the Christian concept *de libero arbitrio*; cf. A. Vaillant, *Le De autexusio de Méthode d'Olympe. Version slave et texte grec édités et traduits en français*, PO, 22.5 (Paris, 1930). I. Dujčev. *Medioevo bizantino-slavo. I. Saggi di storia politica e culturale* (Rome, 1965), 266ff.; *idem.*, in *Studi Veneziani*, 12 (1970), 108ff.

246: Cf. Gen. 1:26ff.; Sap. 9:2; Sir. 17:1ff.

247: τοῦ ... δυσμενοῦς — the Devil.

257–58: ίνα κλέος ἔξοι τὸ καὶ χλόης εύμαραντότερον — cf. Ps. 36:2; I Pet. 5:4.

267ff.: The Christian problem of Evil, i.e., *unde malum*; cf. Basil of Caesarea, *Quod Deus non est auctor malorum*, PG, 31, cols. 330–53; D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism* (Cambridge, 1948; reprint: Middlesex, 1972), 1ff.; Dujčev, in *Studi Veneziani*, 12 (1970), 108ff.

268: οὐδενὸς ἐλαύνοντος — cf. Prov. 28:1.

291 and note 86: II Regn. 15:12ff.; I Para. 27:33–34.

291: Draco or Dracon, Athenian lawgiver (*ca.* 621 B.C.).

291: Solon, Athenian lawgiver (*ca.* 639–*ca.* 599 B.C.).

291: ἐθέσπιζον — θεσπίζω, *sancire*, decree; cf. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, I (Leipzig, 1883), 28 line 24; 93 line 18 (= Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *Chronographia tripartita*, *ibid.*, II [1885], 103 line 6: *sanxit*); 100 line 9 (= Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *ibid.*, 106 line 14: *sanciret*); 153 line 13; 180 line 18 (= Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *ibid.*, 134 line 19: *promulgavit*); 360 lines 4–5 (= Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *ibid.*, 228 line 3: *decrevit*); 399 line 24 (= Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *ibid.*, 258 line 26: *sanxit*); Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, Bonn ed. (1838), 99 lines 9 and 16; 100 line 11, etc. Cf. also θέσπισμα — F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, I (Munich–Berlin, 1924), p. 14, no. 115; p. 38, no. 313; p. 43, no. 355, etc.

297: υἱοθετηθέντων — spiritual adoption as a son, baptism; cf. Rom. 8:15, 23; 9:3-4; Gal. 4:5; Eph. 1:5; cf. Joan. 1:12; I Joan. 3:1; Nicholas Mysticus, *Epistolae*, PG, 111, cols. 85, 188, etc.

299: τὸ τῆς χάριτος εὐαγγέλιον — cf. Matt. 4:23; esp. Act. 20:24.

302: ὁ κύβος — cf. Michael Psellos, *Chronographie*, ed. E. Renault, 2 vols. (Paris, 1926, 1928), I, 30 line 16ff.; II, 65 lines 18-21; II, 81 lines 15-16.

303: νικῆσαι τὰ χείρονα — cf. Homer, *Iliad* I.576.

305-6: τὸ κόνδυν τῆς μέθης — cf. H. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v., κόνδυν — a drinking vessel; cf. Gen. 44:2; Apoc. 14:10, etc.

309: I.e., the Haemus Mountains, in Bulgarian the *Stara-planina*.

309: I.e., the Danube.

310: I.e., Gades, Gadiz, the Straits of Gibraltar.

311: τὸ στέφος — a crown, a wreath, a garland.

311: ὁ δίφρος — i.e., a seat, couch, stool, throne; cf. *Glossar. gr.*, s.v.

311: τὴν Εύρωπην — i.e., esp. the territories of the Balkan peninsula.

313: ἡ ἀνάρρησις — *appellatio imperii*; cf. V. Valdenberg, “Les idées politiques dans les fragments attribués à Pierre le Patrice,” *Byzantion*, 2 (1925), 67ff.; *ibid.*, “Nikoulitza et les historiens byzantins contemporains,” *Byzantion*, 3 (1926), 111ff.; Skabalanovič, *op. cit.* (*supra*, line 74), 145, and 146 note 2, etc.; *Glossar. gr.*, s.v.

313: ἡ σφραγίς — here the sign of the cross.

313ff.: See Introduction, p. 227.

318: τὸ κράτος — the Emperor (Romanus Lecapenus).

320: διαθήκην — testament; but also convention, arrangement between two parties, covenant.

324-25 ff. and note 94: Cf. also Gen. 13:16; 22:17; 28:14; Is. 10:22, etc.

326: Ader — cf. note 60 to line 172.

336: τῆς βουλῆς — i.e., the Senate.

339 and note 98: See “Proteus,” in Roscher, *Lexikon*, II, cols. 3172-78.

343 and note 100: Cf. also Michael Psellos, *Chronographie*, ed. E. Renault, II (Paris, 1928), 183 line 38 and note 5.

352: εὐνομίαι — cf. Valdenberg, “Nikoulitza,” 115.

353ff. and note 105: See also F. Dölger, *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges* (Munich, 1948), no. 37 line 23; see also *Glossar. gr.*, s.v. νοῦντραιοι.

368: σολοικίων — to speak or write incorrectly, coupled with βαρβαρίζειν.

371–72: τὸν . . . ἱεσσαὶ παῖδα — Jesse, father of David; concerning Jesus' family tree, depicted with Jesse as its source, see A. Watson, *The Early Iconography of the Tree of Jesse* (London, 1934); *idem.*, "The Imagery of the Tree of Jesse on the West Front of Orvieto Cathedral," in *Fritz Saxl 1890–1948. A Volume of Memorial Essays from His Friends in England* (London, 1957), 149–64; M. Garidis, "L'ange à cheval dans l'art byzantin," *Byzantion*, 42 (1972), 32ff. with other bibliographical indications. Concerning Jesse in general, see II Regn. 20:1ff.; 23:1ff., etc.

371ff.: The analogies are between David and the Bulgarian King Symeon, between Solomon and King Peter of Bulgaria, and between the building of the Temple of Jerusalem and the conclusion of the peace between Byzantium and Bulgaria in 927. Cf. III Regn. 5:2–4: *Misit autem Salomon ad Hiram, dicens 'Tu scis voluntatem David patris mei, et quia non potuerit aedificare domum nomini Domini Dei sui propter bella imminentia per circuitum, donec daret Dominus eos sub vestigio pedum ejus. Nunc autem requiem dedit Dominus Deus meus mihi per circuitum . . .'*; III Regn. 8:16ff.; I Par. 22:7ff.; 28:3: *Deus autem dixit mihi [David], 'Non aedificabis domum nomini meo, eo quod sis vir bellator, et sanguinem fuderis'*; etc.

380: Cf. note to line 339.

389ff. and note 113: Analogy between the Byzantine-Bulgarian and Judaic-Samaritan enmity; cf. III Regn. 21:16ff.; IV Regn. 13:1ff.; Matt. 10:5; Joan. 8:48ff.; etc.

391: δὲ βλέπων — i.e., the Prophet; cf. note to lines 14–15.

396 and note 117: Cf. Job 10:1ff.; Is. 26:19.

413ff.: οἱ τῆς Ἀγαρ — i.e., the Arabs.

429–30ff.: Cf. Matt. 18:20.

435 and note 123: Cf. also Leo Diaconus, *Historia*, Bonn ed. (1828), 105 line 1ff.; Nicephorus Gregoras, *Historia*, Bonn ed., II (1832), 839 line 16ff.

437: ὀλόφριλοι — cf. Job 4:7; Ps. 51:7.

438: τὰς Πύλας — i.e., the Caspian Gates or Derbent, in Latin *Portae Caspiae*; see Procopius Caesar., *De bello Persico* I.10,4ff.; I.12,2; I.16,7; I.22,5; II.10,21, ed. J. Haury, Teubner (1936), vol. I, 46 line 2ff.; 56 line 2ff.; 81 line 11ff.; 115 line 12ff.; 197 line 3ff.; etc.

439ff.: Cf. Ios. 7:9; I Regn. 24:22ff., Sir. 10:15ff.; Job 18:17.

444ff.: Cf. Herodotus II.15; III.10; etc.

447ff.: See Herodotus II.25ff.

452: The capital of Persia.

452:—53 Eteocles and Polynices, sons of Oedipus.

454—55: Cyrus the Younger, son of Darius Nothus, King of Persia (*ca. 401 B.C.*), and Artaxerxes II (404—358 B.C.).

458ff.: Alexander the Great, son of Philip II and Olympias (356—23 B.C.).

463: Perdiccas, general of Alexander the Great.

463: Antipater, officer of Philip II and Alexander the Great.

465: Italians, i.e., the Romans.

473: ἡ καινότης — the New Testament.

473: ἡ παλαιότης — the Old Testament.

473ff.: ἡ θύραθεν — the profane literature.

483—84ff.: Cf. II Regn. 18:17; Ios. 7:25—26; 8:29.

499: σαγήνης τοῦ Λόγου — i.e., a large dragnet for taking fish, a seine; cf. Matt. 13:47ff.

504: Cf. ὑπερτίθημι — to cross, to passover.

510ff. and note 145: Cf. also Sir. 8:10; II Regn. 22:9; etc.

518 and note 147: Concerning the Queen of Thebes, Niobe, see Roscher, *Lexikon*, III, col. 372ff.

523—24: αὐτοῦ Μωσέως ἡγουμένου — i.e., the Emperor Romanus Lecapenus.

523ff. and note 148: Cf. Gen. 14:7ff.; Exod. 17:8ff.; S. Žebelev, “Oranta. K’ voprosu o vozniknovenii tipa,” *Sem. Kond.*, 1 (1927), 1ff.

526—27: Cf. Rom 12:4ff.; I Cor. 6:15ff.

529—30. and note 150: Cf. also Num. 31:22ff.; Sap. 3:6; Prov. 17:3; 27:21.

537ff.: Cf. Joan. 17:20ff.